

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Briefly Noted

Costa Rican Communists Welcome Soviet Nuclear Blackmail: On 23 October, Andolante, Costa Rican Communist Party newspaper in San Jose published the following telegram sent to Khrushchev by Manuel Mora Valverde, Secretary General of the Partido Vanguardia Popular, which is the name used by the Communist Party of Costa Rica: "The people, a great party, and the communist regime make possible the marvelous advance of Soviet Science. We applaud your words affirming that Soviet power is to be used to guarantee universal peace and to eliminate danger of war." This telegram was sent in the face of unanimous condemnation, on the part of all other elements in Costa Rica, of the refusal of the Soviets to call off their nuclear testing. On 17 October, Khrushchev announced that Soviet Russia would explode a 50-megaton nuclear device. On 23 October, the Soviets exploded a 25-megaton nuclear device and, on 30 October, one of 50-megatons. Using similar statements made by other Communist parties, we indicate that, while the whole world condemns Khrushchev's criminal disregard of human lives, his faithful minions faithfully congratulate him.

Cuban Communists Receive their Basic Primer from Moscow: Havana's Prensa Latina reported on 20 October that the leaflet on the program of the Soviet Communist Party, edited officially by the Cuban national press for distribution to the entire country, is now being distributed to the employees of the Education Ministry. This will no doubt serve as basic primer in all the schools which now serve as indoctrination centers where the minds of the young are formed.

Bertrand Russell Says: (East Berlin radio to U.S. Forces, 24 October). It was a clean bomb the Soviets exploded on 23 October. A Soviet Embassy spokesman in London made this revelation today to Bertrand Russell, one of the world's leading philosophers. The 89-year-old Earl Russell afterwards told the (word indistinct) he had been informed that yesterday's multimegaton atomic blast is very clean, with no fallout. This indicates that Soviet scientists may have cracked the problem of control of nuclear fusion and may have harnessed atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

(New York Times, 25 October) The world-wide explosion of anger was typified by Bertrand Russell, the 89-year-old British philosopher and pacifist, who walked out of the Soviet Embassy in London in disgust. Earl Russell had led delegations of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and the Committee of 100, anti-nuclear organizations, to the Embassy to protest against the latest and biggest explosion. After an hour Lord Russell left, explaining he had done so because Victor Loginov, the Soviet Charge d'Affaires, had "reverted to the old rigamarole and propaganda." Lord Russell said he walked out because he could take refreshments of caviar, sherry, peanuts and tea, but could not "swallow comments about the innocence of the Soviet Union." "The Russians were so innocent," he went on. "Never had there been such innocence in the history of

mankind. I could see no point in staying. I just took my leave and left." Describing his talk with Mr. Loginov, Lord Russell said: "He said it was a wonderful bomb, very clean and no fallout. He said they had been forced into the tests by the Americans and it was a purely defensive move." Lord Russell delivered to the Russians a letter saying the nuclear arms race could end only "in the extermination of both sides." He said the discussion was "very friendly and courteous," and Mr. Loginov had promised to do his best to forward the letter and a report of Lord Russell's statements to Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union.

Demon Tsarapkin: News media assets may be interested in a striking UPI photo of Semyon Tsarapkin denouncing a resolution against the testing of the 50-megaton bomb, at the UN, October 25, 1961. In closeup, it pictures a demoniac expression on the face of the Soviet delegate. Replay in connection with future Tsarapkin activities might be considered.

The Greatest Free Trading Community on Earth: Walter Lippmann's article "The Common Market and the U. S. A." (New York Herald Tribune, 26 October 1961 -- see Press Comment, 26 October) describes and analyzes the significance of the Common Market, which will embrace all 19 European countries which belonged to the first European organization for free economic cooperation, the OEEC. He applauds the revival of Western Europe, which started with the Marshall Plan, as now making possible the use of joint resources with the United States to accomplish better the tasks we have jointly in the world. He calls for a liberal U. S. trading policy, simplifying the arrangements under GATT which made possible a stimulation of multilateral world trade. /The article provides further data in connection with Bi-Weekly Propaganda Guidance #77, Item 449, dated 23 October 1961.7

Soviet Megatons Cause Castro Cheers: On 19 October 1961, Luis Gomez Wanguemert commented on Havana CQM Television Network: "Despite all the furor and preparations for war, imperialism is weaker than socialism. To defend this marvelous world, the Soviet Union has thoughtfully equipped itself with the most powerful and the best arms that can be handled by the best of men. Yes, enormous resources and wealth which were needed for peaceful construction had to be set aside to be used for defense. These sacrifices were not made in vain. The prospects of Cuba are growing. The tremendous bomb of 50 million tons of TNT is a formidable witness to this truth." We single out Cuba as the only alleged "Non-Aligned" nation which has had the effrontery to cheer at the prospect of slow death and destruction which will inevitably result from the Soviets' latest nuclear explosions.

Another Communist Agricultural Failure: A sugar beet experiment which was being conducted, at the Kwadaso Agricultural Training Center in Ghana by a four member East German agricultural team has met with the complete failure that might have been expected of such an experiment under Communist auspices. The lack of success is merely a repetition of the same agricultural story in all the Sino-Soviet bloc. The East German team also tried to grow cabbage, tomatoes and corn, also without success.

Khrushch and Insects

The following appeared in Forum, published in Vienna, in September:
(Translation ours)

CAUTIOUS DICTIONARY

From the Worterbuch der russischen Sprache (Dictionary of the Russian language) by S.I. Oshegov, State Publishing House for Foreign and International Dictionaries, Moscow, 1952 Edition, page 806:

Khrushch -- m., Name of certain beetles, for ex. of
cockchafers (Tr: a European flying beetle);
insect injurious to crops.

From the same dictionary, 1960 Edition, p. 856:

Khrushch -- m., name of beetles of the species to which
cockchafers belong.

Period. Just so no one has any evil thoughts.

~~SECRET~~

6 November 1961

25X1C10b

451. GHANA: Nkrumah Further Reduces Opposition

Background: The life of anybody opposing the policies of President Nkrumah ever since Ghana became independent four years ago has not been easy; in recent weeks it has become almost impossible. On 3 October the Nkrumah regime arrested prominent political adversaries and leaders of strikes the previous month against the austerity budget that increased taxation and imposed a system of deductions from wages as compulsory national savings. Among those taken into custody were: P.K.K. Quaido, a member of the moderate wing of the ruling Convention People's Party and a former Cabinet Member; Joseph Appiah, the deputy leader of the small parliamentary group of the opposition United Party and son-in-law of the well-known British politician, the late Sir Stafford Cripps; and the veteran politician, J.B. Danquah, whom many of his fellow citizens regard as the true father of their country rather than Kwame Nkrumah. The Cabinet had been re-shuffled: at the request of Nkrumah six Ministers had resigned, including the Minister of Health and former Finance Minister, K.A. Gbedemah, a moderate who for years had worked closely with Nkrumah. Gbedemah reportedly has now fled the country. The regime had already expelled almost all the British officials, including army officers, who had been still serving in Ghana. One of the last remaining British officials in a high post to be removed from office was Geoffrey Bing, Communist former Laborite member of the British parliament, who was serving as Attorney General. Bing, however, has been asked to remain in Ghana where, it is said, he will be kept "to carry out certain assignments". The removal of British officers comes on the eve of the expected visit (November 9-20) by Queen Elizabeth of Great Britain. Prior to these recent events Nkrumah had been absent from the country for some weeks, visiting East Europe, the Soviet Union and Communist China. At the Belgrade Conference of "non-aligned" states, he was one of the leaders in promoting the double standard, of seeing evil only if it occurred in the West. In a speech at Tashkent on July 17 he said: "The peoples of the Soviet Union by the manner in which they have welded many republics and nationalities into one great country have demonstrated the effectiveness of political union, and this is most inspiring for us in our struggle for the political unification of the African continent." Two days later at Kiev he said, on the same subject: "This is an achievement which we can surely emulate in Africa, where the conditions for unity are so favorable and the necessity so imperative."

25X1C10b

~~SECRET~~

(continued)

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

~~SECRET~~

6 November 1961

25X1C10b

452. THE CUBAN TRIP - Ar. Mo 20071116 Belgrade RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Background: At Christmastide 1960 in Havana a life-size representation of the crib surrounded by the holy family and groups of shepherds, depicted Fidel Castro, his brother Raul and various members of the Government among those who came to adore the Christ child. Just as Castro, by this means, attempted to identify himself with the deep-seated devotion of the Cuban people, he has similarly attempted to portray himself and his Communist regime as being a member of the Latin-American family or, when it suits him better, as a leader of the neutral or unaligned nations.

Since May 1961, Cuban Communists have attempted to convince Latin-American leaders that their regime wishes to remain a member of the inter-American community, does not intend to intervene in the internal affairs of the other American Republics, and desires to have cordial relations with all States of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States, on the basis of respect for Cuba's sovereignty, as a socialist but not Communist state.

During the special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council (IA-ECOSOC) of the Organization of American States (OAS), which took place from 5 to 15 August at Punta del Este, Uruguay, "Che" Guevara, Cuba's economic commissar, announced that Cuba intended "to cooperate in the strengthening of the inter-American system, on the basis of true independence and friendship with various nations." He said that he believed in a system of "genuine peaceful coexistence in the Americas" and that Cuba pursued an "independent" foreign policy. Subsequently, he alleged that Cuba's relations with Soviet Russia were strictly commercial.

It is worth noting here that, during his visits to Latin America, "Che" Guevara has not hesitated to play on the fact that he is Argentinian by birth and still retains Argentinian citizenship. His family still lives in the Argentine.

Although the Soviets frowned on the idea of the meeting of Non-Aligned nations proposed by Nasser and Tito, they apparently made no effort to dissuade Castro from attending as a member of the Non-Aligned nations. This, on the contrary, suited the purpose of the Soviets who have been somewhat reluctant to see Cuba too closely identified as a Soviet Bloc nation for fear that this might alienate the other Latin American nations who have tended to look with favor upon Castro's original successful revolution against Batista's dictatorship.

Castro's first effort to identify himself with the Non-Aligned nations took place during the preparatory conference in Cairo in June 1961. During the Conference of Non-Aligned Nations which took place in Belgrade during the first week of September 1961, President Oswaldo Dorticos of Cuba adopted such a violent position, in effect paraphrasing the statements made by Khrushchev on various international problems, that the neutral leaders, particularly Tito and Nasser, wondered whether their invitation to Cuba had not been a monumental error. Dorticos, nonetheless, attempted to gain a position of leadership over the non-aligned nations.

~~SECRET~~

(Continued)

6 November 1961

The adherence of the Cuban Communists to Marxism-Leninism has been unequivocally stated by Castro, Dorticos, Guevara and others, in spite of efforts to portray Cuba as a member of the inter-American community or as a neutral member of the Non-Aligned nations. Castro's official proclamation, on May 1, that Cuba was the first Social Democratic Republic of Latin America, leaves no room for any doubt as to Cuba's exact place within the Communist orbit.

As if to confirm Cuba's position, Oswaldo Dorticos, during his trip to Czechoslovakia, Moscow and Peking after the Belgrade meeting in September, carefully spelled out his subservience to all phases of Soviet doctrine. In the Cuban-Czech communique Dorticos officially went on record advocating the fostering of what he referred to as the "liberation movements" of Latin America. Castro and his lieutenants have consistently attempted to identify their bold Communist "liberation movement" with the 26th of July Movement, which had widespread appeal throughout Latin America as a valid indigenous uprising against the dictatorship of Batista. In this manner Cuba has sought to identify with popular sympathies in Latin America and to assert leadership over the masses in that hemisphere. Cuban leaders have, while denying any intention to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, recommended the use of the Cuban-style guerrilla warfare to the peoples of Brazil and other countries. On 11 September, in a speech in Moscow, Dorticos praised the CPSU draft party program as the "document which is the herald of the future radiant era of mankind". The joint Cuban-Soviet communique, issued on 21 September, stated that "both parties have reasserted the identity of their positions in all international problems".

The State controlled radio in Havana at no time attempts to camouflage the fact that it preaches unadulterated Communist doctrine. On 17 September, Lionel Soto, speaking over Radio Centro said: "The revolution (in Cuba) had found itself confronted with a lack of socialist cadres and this created a problem of prime importance. The honest and hardworking must be formed into revolutionary cadres because many of them do not have an understanding of "socialism" (i.e. communism). He explained that the study of Marxism and Leninism must be undertaken if the science of "socialism" is to be understood. Schools, such as the Jose Marti boarding school in Rio del Mar, have been established for the indoctrination of children in the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

On 17 October, Havana Radio stated: "The 22nd Congress of the Soviet Communist Party represents a hallmark in the history of mankind". . . . It marks the start of a new period in the history of mankind, It is the point of departure of the most advanced stage in human and social development. "

On 18 October, Luis Gomez Wanguemert, speaking over Havana CQM Television Network said: "If the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party has an exceptional importance for all mankind, it has a special meaning for our own people engaged in the task of building "socialism". . . . The people who have chosen the path of "socialism" (i.e. Cuba) know now for sure that this road will surely and firmly lead to the definitive state of justice, progress, and welfare -- Communism. "

The 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has been attended by the leaders (in most cases the Secretary General) of the Communist Parties of every country. In the case of Cuba, however, the delegation consisted

of members of the Integrated Revolutionary Organization (ORI). The formation of this monolithic state party was announced by Fidel Castro on 26 July 1961. (See Bi-Weekly Guidance #433). Many of its leaders are former leaders of the Partido Socialista Popular (PSP) which was the name used by the Communist Party of Cuba. The ORI members who attended are:

Blas Roca, National Director of the ORI (former Secretary General of the PSP)

Captain Emilio Aragones, National Director of the ORI.

Augustin Martinez Sanchez, National Director of the ORI, (Minister of Labor, who masterminded the take-over of the free labor unions by the communists).

Rita Diaz, a local secretary of the ORI (former PSP leader).

Since the PSP no longer officially exists in Cuba, it appears quite clear that the only party officially existing in Cuba today, the ORI, is none other than the Communist Party of Cuba.

During his address to the 22nd Congress on 21 October, Blas Roca was reported by Radio Moscow to have stressed that the patriotic, democratic and "socialist" Cuban revolution, as well as its rapid and successful development, were a brilliant practical realization of the CPSU draft program's thesis on the nature of the modern era, which is marked by the transition from capitalism to "socialism". Referring to Blas Roca as the "Head of the Delegation of the Integrated Revolutionary Organization", the Moscow radio reported that he had said that "the Cuban people drew inspiration and new strength for further struggle from the CPSU draft program."

Finally, Raul Roa, Cuba's Foreign Minister, in a press interview on 20 October over Havana CQM Television Network, stated: "What was utopia is becoming historical reality in the Soviet Union. Communism is the realization of all the dreams of mankind".

Should there still remain any doubt concerning the total subservience of the Cuban Communists to their Soviet masters, the position adopted by Cuba in the UN regarding the Soviet nuclear tests should convince even the greatest skeptics. Cuba was the only self-claimed non-bloc country to vote with the Soviet bloc countries against an eight nation resolution, considered by the General Assembly of the UN sitting as the Political Committee, which urged Soviet Russia to cancel its plans to set off a 50-megaton nuclear explosion. The resolution was approved by a vote of 75 to 10. Further, when Raul Roa spoke to Cuban Foreign Ministry personnel during the week of October 23 (reported in the New York Herald Tribune on October 27) he said: "There will be a Communist society in this century. The program of the Soviet Communist Party means that mankind enters with a firm step on the roads of Communism. The death of capitalism is decreed by history but the body still has to be buried." 25X1C10b

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

6 November 1961

25X1C10b

453. AFRICA: Luthuli Awarded Nobel Peace Prize

[REDACTED] through him for his selection

[REDACTED]

of it) sympathizes with him in his struggle and for his selection.

Background: For the first time the Nobel peace prize has been awarded to an African. The winner on the present occasion (for the year 1960) is Albert John Luthuli, a Zulu Chief and President General of the African National Congress, dismissed in 1953 by the South African Government and later debarred from attending any gatherings public or private. Luthuli (he himself spells it Lutuli but he is known in South Africa and internationally as Luthuli) was nominated for the prize by Swedish Social Democrats and the announcement that he had won was made at the same time that a similar announcement, covering the year 1961, was made for the late Secretary-General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjold. For years Luthuli has been intimately involved in action against the South African Government's segregation (apartheid) policies. He has now received an award which has placed him suddenly on the world stage along with previous winners of the Nobel peace prize such as Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Lord Robert Cecil and Dag Hammarskjold. It is true that there are many others in South Africa who have followed a similar policy and others who have attained national prominence for the same reasons. Nobody, however, has surpassed or even equalled him for peaceful resistance - in the true Gandhi manner. It is interesting that Gandhi as a young lawyer was engaged in much the same struggle in South Africa before returning to his native land, India, to lead the peaceful fight for independence there. Luthuli, like Gandhi, is widely known as a firm believer in non-violent resistance to all the edicts of apartheid in South Africa. He is also known as a political moderate who rejects the extremes of both left and right. He was born in 1898 (he himself says he does not know the exact date of his birth) at Solusia Mission Station in Southern Rhodesia where his father was doing Christian missionary work as evangelist-interpreter for the Seventh Day Adventist Church. The family later moved to Groutville (named after an American missionary) in South Africa where Luthuli went to Primary School. He completed his intermediate school education at Edendale, a Methodist institution, and later joined the Teachers' Training Department in the same institution. After spending 16 years, during which he joined the Christian church, as a teacher, he led the life of an elected Zulu Chief, principally involving administrative and judiciary duties. He gradually became involved in the political struggle, always following non-violent methods. The chieftainship had more and more involved him in what he has called "the vital problems of African life" and to this day, even under severe restrictions, he is still trying, (as he has put it) "knocking in vain, patiently, moderately and modestly at a closed and barred door."

[REDACTED]

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

454. Socialist International Stands with Free World Against Communism

those issues today creating tension and fear.

Background: Meeting in Rome, on 27 October the Socialist International, representing the Democratic Socialist parties of forty-three countries, adopted ten resolutions. They, unanimously and by acclamation, proclaimed the solidarity of the Socialist International with the Berliners and condemned the "savage brutality" of the East Berlin Wall. They urged the West to take the diplomatic initiative to safeguard peace in Berlin and the freedom of its people. They argued against the continued partition of Germany. They argued for controlled disarmament in Central Europe. They expressed their total opposition to the Soviet "troika" plan for the UN Secretariat, while arguing for some reform in the organization of the Secretariat. They expressed deep concern over the widening gap in living standards between the industrialized nations and those still developing. They condemned racial segregation in South Africa. They urged peaceful settlement of the Algerian problem. They favored enlargement of the UN Security Council, with India as a (presumably permanent) member. They proposed that an International Peace Corps be established. They favored admission of Communist China to the UN.

The Socialist International represents the forces of organized Democratic Socialism throughout the world. These socialists are essentially non-communists and indeed have reason based on history to fear communist interference and infiltration. They represent a substantial segment of labor and leftist thought outside of the Communist Bloc. Their influence in most countries in Europe, the Near East, and in some non-communist Asian and Latin American countries is considerable. Their achievements are particularly notable in Western Europe, while in Japan, Indonesia, Burma, India and Ceylon they have carried marked weight.

25X1C10b

~~SECRET~~

(continued)

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

~~SECRET~~

6 November 1961

25X1C10b

454. Socialist International Stands with Free World Against Communism

Background: Meeting in Rome, on 27 October the Socialist International, representing the Democratic Socialist parties of forty-three countries, adopted ten resolutions. They, unanimously and by acclamation, proclaimed the solidarity of the Socialist International with the Berliners and condemned the "savage brutality" of the East Berlin Wall. They urged the West to take the diplomatic initiative to safeguard peace in Berlin and the freedom of its people. They argued against the continued partition of Germany. They argued for controlled disarmament in Central Europe. They expressed their total opposition to the Soviet "troika" plan for the UN Secretariat, while arguing for some reform in the organization of the Secretariat. They expressed deep concern over the widening gap in living standards between the industrialized nations and those still developing. They condemned racial segregation in South Africa. They urged peaceful settlement of the Algerian problem. They favored enlargement of the UN Security Council, with India as a (presumably permanent) member. They proposed that an International Peace Corps be established. They favored admission of Communist China to the UN.

The Socialist International represents the forces of organized Democratic Socialism throughout the world. These socialists are essentially non-communists and indeed have reason based on history to fear communist interference and infiltration. They represent a substantial segment of labor and leftist thought outside of the Communist Bloc. Their influence in most countries in Europe, the Near East, and in some non-communist Asian and Latin American countries is considerable. Their achievements are particularly notable in Western Europe, while in Japan, Indonesia, Burma, India and Ceylon they have carried marked weight.

25X1C10b

~~SECRET~~

(continued)

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Background: Once European nations and the US had planted their flags and sent their merchants to areas populated by non-Europeans, there was no turning back for those areas. The native cultures were unable to compete militarily, economically, or scientifically with the West; at most, they could maintain their traditional religious beliefs and some remnants of their traditional social patterns. Beginning with Japan, the nations affected have drawn the inevitable conclusions, i. e. that the only way to achieve and preserve real independence, to advance their economic and cultural status, is to follow the example of the modern industrialized nations.

Today, most of these peoples have political independence, but with the exception of Japan, their countries are still underdeveloped. And today, two different patterns of development are available: the West-European-American and the Communist. (There are in fact two different Communist patterns, Moscow's and Peiping's, but for the purposes of this discussion, we may regard them as one.) The present and potential leaders of these countries face a choice between adopting a thoroughly planned, tightly controlled system on the Communist pattern, or a free choice system, e. g. a free enterprise or democratic socialist orientation, modelled on the societies of Western Europe and the United States. The essential choice, be it emphasized, is not between capitalism and socialism, but between a system where economic and political decisions are reached by compromise between competing interests (public and/or private), and one in which all such decisions are made unilaterally by a single leader or a small ruling clique. For a centralized leadership, making all decisions and operating according to a fixed plan, cannot maintain itself and carry out its program unless it employs a totalitarian ideology and suppresses all criticism ruthlessly. Communist leadership is opposed to free choice; we consider free choice essential, the foundation for political freedom, individual self-realization, cultural advance and human dignity.

Although Communist ideology is rigid and exclusive, certain beliefs make it a tempting alternative to leaders of opinion in underdeveloped countries. We must recognize these beliefs frankly:

1. Western Europe and the United States are widely considered racist and colonialist -- even though racism is now discredited or on the defensive everywhere except in South Africa, and even though the Russian empire is the only one to have annexed, rather than lost, huge territories in the 20th century.

2. Communist organizations offer to impoverished intellectuals opportunities for personal advancement and the exercise of power not available to them in conventional societies.

3. Communist planning appears to promise more rapid modernization than could be attained by an open society.

6 November 1961

~~Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6~~
~~SECRET~~
appeal. The fear of Soviet power should not, however, be over-rated as a motivating force. Men who have fought in jungles or lived in prison are not likely to be cowards, and in any case, the Soviet threat does not appear to be directed primarily at them. If they fear anything in connection with this problem of choice, it is their own public opinion... What can the West say or do to dispel these ideas? Beliefs 2 through 4 above, the positive appeals, are based on promise rather than performance.

Re Pt. 2 (Careers for impoverished intellectuals). Those who hope to make a career with communism might well reflect on the fact that, of all the 1917 leaders, only Lenin is still honored, Bukharin, Rykov, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, and now Stalin all being disgraced (most of them found a violent death.) Similarly, of Stalin's last associates, Beria, Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich, Bulganin, Saburov, Pervukhim, and Voroshilov have all been denounced or worse; only Mikoyan, Suslov, and Khrushchev himself are still prominent. Of course, a real careerist will not be deterred by the statistics; national and international society can only seek to protect itself against the real gangsters by exposing their selfish, power-seeking motivation. There are others, however, who sincerely aspire to help their countries. We should explain to them that "schools" such as the "Friendship University" are intended to train obedient agitators; at best, the career they prepare for is that of a puppet leader, a Walter Ulbricht. On the other hand, by gaining a technical and cultural education at western or western-modelled universities, potential leaders can effectively serve their countries and join the ranks of the world's intellectual elite. The Western pattern offers able young leaders a chance to develop in accordance with their abilities, to seek answers in a community of thought that admits the possibility of new and original solutions.

Re pt. 3 (Communist planning): It is a misconception to think that the alternative to Communist state planning is no planning. Pure laissez faire capitalism never existed, and since the world depression of the 1930's, all Western nations have given social security and public works programs priority over the interests of the rentier (coupon-clipper) and the banker. One decisive reflection of this change was the end of the international gold standard; another was the spread of effective labor union organization to all Western countries. It is no exaggeration to say that there has been a social revolution in the West in the last 30 years. It has been accomplished, however, without dogma, hence without branding the old elite as outcasts, or depriving them of all voice in affairs. Thus the West does not stand for a rigid Victorian capitalist society, approaching the brink of class warfare or imperialist war, but rather for a gradual revolution in which increasing benefits are being gained by the masses.

The West does not oppose planning, it only recognizes that planning has its limits. Every country is endowed with certain resources in land, minerals, labor, and industrial plant. These constitute its wealth. Some increase in wealth can be obtained by organizational improvements -- that is, by planning -- but there is a limit to what can be accomplished in a few years. Planners cannot suddenly multiply the number of man-hours or the number of acres of farmland. Indeed, the only rapid way to increase national wealth is to import it -- that is, to get loans or grants from abroad. Communist planning often juggles resources

6 November 1961

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

in an attempt to make a show of growth in a particular sector, but the increase which appears in one sector (such as steel production) does not come out of a magic lamp, it is bought by actual sacrifices in other sectors (such as agriculture and especially consumer goods). This sacrifice could not be imposed without totalitarian minority rule. Communist rulers are typically devoted to the building-up of heavy industry, which means military power and which also represents a sort of large machinery fetishism -- an outdated ideal, recalling the era of Big Bertha, the Forth Bridge, and the Corliss steam engine. Underdeveloped countries certainly need an industrial base, but for most of them the "problem of problems" is assuring a food supply for a growing population. Experience shows that the adoption of Communist planning by an underdeveloped nation means, with some certainty, that human beings are going to starve. On the other hand, balanced development with western assistance offers a chance -- for many lands the only chance -- to outmatch the growth of population.

Re pt. 4 (The rapid growth of Communist power): While Soviet production has indeed grown, actual performance has been less striking than the picture presented by Communist propaganda. The propaganda technique employed is to stress certain economic sectors, to which resources have been diverted from other sectors. Moreover, Communist attainments have usually proved unimpressive when compared with free societies under comparable conditions. East Berlin could not stand the "peaceful competition" of West Berlin, and so Ulbricht has to build his wall. The Indian mixed economy attained an average annual industrial growth rate of 9 to 10% in the last decade, while West Germany (less socialized and with greater previous development, but like the Soviet Union with a backlog of reconstruction to accomplish) had an average annual industrial growth rate of 13.6% in the same period. The Soviet 7-Year Plan schedules an industrial growth rate of 8.8% per annum, although Khrushchev claims that 10% was achieved in the first three years.¹ Far from dying, private enterprise tends to grow irresistibly wherever -- as in India -- it is permitted to participate in a growing economy. Lenin had to resort to it to restore the ravages of war and revolution, and even today, after forty-four years of Soviet power, the tiny private plots on the collective farms still produce 48.2% of the Soviet meat and lard output, 48.5% of the milk supply, and 78% of the egg yields. Private enterprise is at its best in expanding conditions; Western governments have found state ownership useful mainly in times of depression or in unprofitable industries (like the British coal industry, or the British, Canadian, and French railroad systems) where, for social reasons,

¹A comparison of over-all production, rather than merely industrial production, would be less favorable to the Soviet Union than this. Also, Soviet growth claims are inflated by means of various Soviet statistical practices and by padded production reports; Soviet annual industrial growth will probably be 8% or less, rather than the 8.8% of the 7-Year Plan, the approximately 9.5% of the first ten years of the Twenty-Year Program, or Khrushchev's 10%. Steel production, the backbone of Soviet industry, is not expected to grow faster than 7%, even in the 20-Year Program, and under normal conditions, over-all industrial production growth equals or only exceeds very slightly the growth rate in steel.

6 November 1961

bankruptcy and abandonment are not the only possibilities. Suppose that the Soviet economy as a whole would have grown more rapidly if there had been no Communist dictatorship.

Still, one might argue that since the bias of Soviet growth really does further military strength, communism might be made the "wave of the future" by force. This, of course, depends ultimately on the will of the non-Communist world. The West is not presently behind in over-all military strength; where the Soviets have gained advantages in certain fields, such as large rockets or conventional ground forces, this has been due to Western interest in other pursuits, rather than incapacity, and the gaps are now being closed. The question of meeting Communist force is one for underdeveloped countries as well as for the West; the neutrals must make their decision on the kind of society they want and act accordingly.

On pt. 1 (The concept of the West as colonialist and racist), we face, not a promise, but a somewhat distorted past picture improperly applied to the present. Today most Westerners would be tongue-tied if asked to defend colonialism, let alone racialism. The latter was permanently discredited by Belsen and Buchenwald; we don't defend it and we refuse to be identified with it. Significantly, humor at the expense of Jews and negroes has completely disappeared from the respectable Western press. The question of colonialism is somewhat more complicated. As a political phenomenon, colonialism is dead or dying, and rightly so. Charges are made today of economic "neo-colonialism", but the US itself absorbed a large amount of foreign investment in the 19th century without feeling any threat to its independence; and gunboats and marines no longer appear when foreign properties are nationalized. Even if we look at the past, the colonialists in many areas did more than govern and exploit. While there was some self-deception involved in such concepts as "stewardship" and "la mission civilisatrice", these ideas were not wholly false. This has been proven particularly in the Philippines and in certain former British colonies, where western democratic institutions have taken root. Leaders in these countries may be outspoken opponents of colonialism, but they are also wedded to western concepts of parliamentary democracy and judicial process. The truth is that Western industry and military technology were and are only a part -- and not the most important part -- of what the West has carried to the rest of the world. These aspects of Western society developed in an atmosphere of political freedom, scientific enquiry, and respect for human dignity, where religious belief and tolerance existed together. Newton, Darwin, and Einstein were products of Western culture. There is a long tradition of political and moral thought in the West, beginning with Pericles, influenced by Christianity, and extending through Shakespeare, Locke, Montesquieu, Jefferson, Hamilton, Tocqueville, Lincoln and George Bernard Shaw to Albert Camus and George Orwell -- and we might also add, Karl Marx and Harold Laski, neither of whom could have emerged in a totalitarian society. It is the West which has identified the problem of political power and its control as the central problem for society. It is the Communists who attempt to conceal its importance, precisely for the purpose of exercising power. The Communists offer a truncated version of Western progress, a two-dimensional facade painted with pictures of factory chimneys and stamping mills. The West itself offers a rich culture, one which can moreover be accommodated to the traditions and the beliefs of non-Western peoples.

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

NUMBER 78

6 November 1961

ADDENDUM

Item 452 - See Bi-Weekly #75, Item #433, dated 25 September 1961, Castro's Cuba - Socialist or Communist?

See Dept. of State Instruction No. CW-3443, dated 18 October 1961, Subject: Cuba's Alignment with the Sino-Soviet Bloc (CONF) and its UNCLASSIFIED enclosure #3, Text of Soviet-Cuban Communiqué and enclosure #4, Text of Chinese Cuban Communiqué.

Item 456 - See Bi-Weekly #62, Item #367, dated 27 March 1961, The Individual in the Communist State.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Castro Urges Guerrilla Warfare in Brazil (Excerpts from the address of Fidel Castro before the Conference on Production, August 29, 1961).
2. Excerpts from Speech of President Dorticos at the Non-Aligned Conference, Belgrade, September 2, 1961.
3. Excerpts from Cuban-Czech Communiqué of September 11, 1961 on the Occasion of the Visit to Czechoslovakia of President Oswaldo Dorticos.
4. Adam Schaff on Humanism and Freedom (5 articles).

CROSS-INDEX

451. GHANA: Nkrumah Further Reduces Opposition - G.
452. THE CUBAN TROIKA: Moscow, Belgrade, Punta del Este - A, C, D, E, I, S, U.
453. AFRICA: Luthuli Awarded Nobel Peace Prize - G.
454. Socialist International Stands with Free World Against Communism - S, T.
455. What the West has to Offer the Underdeveloped Nations - E, I, P.
456. Prominent Polish Marxist on Socialist Humanism and Freedom - C, H.

~~SECRET~~

Excerpts from Cuban-Czech Communiqué of September 11, 1961 on the
Occasion of the Visit to Czechoslovakia of President Osvaldo Dorticos

"Evaluating the international situation, the two Presidents agreed that the existence and growth of the world socialist system constitutes the principal factor which determines the character of the present period of history. The extensive development, economically, scientifically, technically, and culturally in this system reflected in the colossal feats of the Soviet cosmic flights opens unique possibilities for a new apogee for welfare and happiness for all humanity. The untiring efforts for peace and the high-principled policy of the Soviet Union and of all the socialist camp represents a guarantee for freedom and independence and a boost to the aspirations of the peaceful people of all nations."

The President of the Republic of Cuba and the President of the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia emphatically condemned the imperialist policy of bellicose threats, intimidations, and aggressions against the freedom of the peoples and against world peace.

The two presidents consider it necessary that the consequent application of the principles of peaceful coexistence and collaboration among nations with different social systems -- in agreement with the contents of the "resolution on the measures for the application and the broadening of peaceful relations and good neighborliness among the nations," adopted by the Thirteenth U.N. General Assembly -- constitute the basis of the policy of all the governments in international relations.

They went on record, unanimously, that the foreign policy of both nations is completely oriented in this respect and that one of its principal objectives is to contribute, as efficiently as possible, to the maintenance of world peace.

The two high representatives were in accord that it is necessary to eliminate all the handicaps which block the way to the lessening of international tension and of the achievement of a policy of peaceful coexistence. They particularly asserted their conviction that it is necessary to eradicate all the vestiges of the Second World War. In this respect, the two statesmen underscored with special emphasis the urgency for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

The growth of militarism and revanchism in West Germany entails a grave danger which threatens world peace. The postponement of the conclusion of a peace treaty only strengthens the aggressive aspirations of militarist West German circles and feeds the wellsprings of international discord.

The two high representatives of Cuba and Czechoslovakia went on record concerning the successes of the development of the liberation movements of the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, expressing their warmest sympathy for these movements.

The two Presidents expressed their conviction that the United Nations fulfills an important role in the solution of the most pressing problems. However, the structure of the United Nations should adjust itself to the substantial changes which have occurred in the world since its founding, so it may convert itself into an efficient instrument for the peaceful solution of international conflicts. In the United Nations and in all the organizations, there should be an equitable representation of all the principal groups of states which exist in the world at present; namely, the neutral nations, the socialist states,

(Continued)

and the Western powers with their allies. In this respect, the two parties expressed their support of the recognition of the legal right of representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and the incorporation of the Mongolian People's Republic in the aforementioned organization.

The process of organization of planned economic development already under way, as well as the direction given to the national development for the creation of a socialist future for Cuba, are among the great conquests which the heroic Cuban people were able to achieve, assure, and defend gloriously under the guidance of its Revolutionary Government headed by Fidel Castro.

The Cuban and Czech Presidents underscored their common accord on the contribution of the Cuban revolution to the national liberation movements and their contribution to the cause of peace, freedom, and progress in all the world; stressing as well that Cuba also contributes in an important manner in the field of international relations, and above all in the United Nations, in support of the policy of peaceful coexistence and collaboration among all the nations.

The Cuban President expressed his full appreciation for the prodigious work carried out by the Czech Government and people in the construction of a developed socialist society, as well as his warm recognition of the great contribution of the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic to the maintenance of peace, and his deep gratitude for the decisive assistance which it is giving the Cuban Government and people in the field of technical progress and national economic development.

Excerpts from Speech of President Dorticos at the Non-Aligned Conference,
Belgrade, September 2, 1961

On these continents [Asia and Africa] and in Latin America, for various reasons and in different forms, economic and political imperialism, in its desperate and agonizing convulsions, is intending to drown the movements of national liberation in blood and misery. International perfidy, bribery on a world scale, and military violence are today the instruments which are being used inhumanly by colonialist and imperialist countries.

The imperialists' stubbornness in our continent has reached the limit where the U.S. Government is not even prepared to tolerate other friendly governments maintaining an independent foreign policy and defending the right of self-determination of the Cuban people. Today we have to regret that as a consequence of that stubbornness and of the imperialist pressure united with the reactionary national oligarchic groups, the constitutional ex-President of Brazil, Sr. Janio Quadros, has felt himself obliged to decline to fulfill his duties, and that fraternal nation is today exposed to the danger of a reactionary military dictatorship. This is certainly not the road to peace and there are no signs that the imperialist powers are sincerely disposed to coexist peacefully with the nations and peoples unwilling to submit to their designs.

We must insist that the German problem should be solved by peaceful negotiations; and, as rearmament is now an undoubted fact, we must call for the immediate signature of a peace treaty which would confirm the frontiers of Germany as they were established at Potsdam. Further, in considering the German problem, we cannot overlook one indisputable geographical and historical fact -- namely, the actual existence of two German States. It is only from this standpoint that the German problem can be approached.

On a number of occasions, and particularly in the case of the Congo, there has been abundant evidence that the composition and structure of the United Nations Secretariat, far from being suitable for the execution and implementation of decisions, tends in practice to result in their distortion. It must therefore be said at the outset that the present structure is not suited to the purposes of the Organization as defined in the Charter. In the first place, we must acknowledge that the Secretariat should no longer remain under the control of a single individual, whose assumed neutrality -- as has been shown by events in the Congo and by the murder of Lumumba -- does not offer any guarantee that the Organization's executive powers will be properly used. At this Conference we must try to reach agreement on the urgent need to modify the structure of the Secretariat and thereby to ensure impartiality in the implementation of decisions.

CASTRO URGES GUERRILLA WARFARE IN
BRAZIL

Excerpts from the address of Fidel Castro before the Conference
on Production, August 29, 1961/ Translation

"That is the situation there (Ed. - in Brazil). All popular forces of the left, progressive and nationalistic, are grouping against the coup. The Congress is against the coup; the military men are being left isolated. It may be that they may continue their absurd plans. We know perfectly well that if the people resist, the military will not be able to carry out their maneuver. In a gigantic country such as Brazil, those military men do not know what revolutionary guerrillas are. If the people of Brazil take advantage of Cuba's experience, if they hurl themselves into the struggle, in the mountains, in the jungles, in the woods, in that immense territory, in that immense theater of war which is Brazil, and if advantage is taken of Cuba's experience and they take up arms and organize a guerrilla war not a conventional battle on the plains - if they do not have available sufficient forces to organize the guerrilla struggle in Brazil, let them use Cuba's experience in which a very few men were able to confront the professional army. In addition, the Brazilian Army counts on many honorable military men, on revolutionary military men, on nationalistic military men who will never join the group of fascistic instigators of a coup - pro-imperialists who are directing this maneuver against the people of Brazil. If the workers and the peasants and the students and the progressive men and honest military men take up arms and organize not one fighting front but a thousand fighting fronts, never will the group of reactionary military men be able to count on anything to crush the people with certainty; and in spite of the initial attempts, the military might carry out a movement which they could however not implant; neither the army, which is with the reaction, or even the forces of NATO, would be able to destroy the Brazilian revolutionary movement. We, naturally, know that these blows are also directed against us..."

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

~~SECRET~~

20 November 1961

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6
Briefly Noted

Any CPSU Members in the Wave of the Future?:

The CPSU has always made a point of keeping the Soviet people and its own membership in a certain state of insecurity. In 1919, party members were "reregistered", with the result that half of the membership of over 250,000, 1/4 of the party, were expelled. According to Khrushchev's own Secret Speech of 1956, 98 out of the 139 members and candidate members of the Central Committee elected at the 17th Congress in January 1934 were purged in 1937 and 1938; in those days being purged usually meant death either in the labor camps or by shooting. It is estimated that over 1,500,000 party members were purged between 1933 and 1939, the 1933 party membership having been 3,555,338. At the 22nd Congress, Khrushchev announced that 200,000 members had been dropped from the party in the last six years. Also at the 22nd Congress, Khrushchev paid his respects to the "old Bolsheviks" present; it would have been interesting to have had a show of hands of the old Bolsheviks to see how many were left.

Cuban Communists Using Chinese Communist Texts:

According to a New China News Agency release of 22 September, the Cuban National Publication Bureau announced that 250,000 copies of Spanish translations of Mao Tse-Tung's works have been sold in Cuba since the beginning of 1961. In addition, 180,000 copies of various Spanish language books concerning China and a large quantity of Chinese Communist magazines were reported to have been sold in the same period. We wonder whether, in view of Khrushchev's thinly veiled attack on Mao Tse-Tung in his speech to the 22nd Congress of the Soviet Communist Party on 17 October, the Cuban Communists will persist in spreading the dogmatism of Mao.

Opposition to Soviet Economic Aid:

The newspaper La Nacion of La Paz, which is the organ of the official party of Bolivia, has expressed opposition to the acceptance of the Soviet offer of aid. The newspaper pointed out that in Cuba, Soviet credits have taken the shape of weapons, some machinery, but no capital. We suggest that this type of Soviet aid is in direct contrast with the aid proposed by the Alliance for Progress, the basic purpose of which is to enable the Latin American countries to develop their own resources.

Stalin's Birthday:

The attention of all stations is called to the fact that December 21 is Stalin's birthday. Suitable econiums might well be placed in left-wing press publications, as well as letters to the editor, etc. It should also be borne in mind that March 5 is the 8th anniversary of Stalin's death, and preparations should be made for running suitable memorials on that date.

~~SECRET~~

(Continued)

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

The Eastern Orthodox Church Conference:

The Eastern Orthodox Church conference, which took place 24-30 September on the Greek Island of Rhodes and which was attended by delegations from Russia and other Bloc countries, found the Bloc delegates, under Soviet leadership following the usual Soviet line. It was commented that their speeches frequently appeared straight out of the Communist Party handbook. They scored no significant success however in achieving a dominant position in the hierarchy, although they did manage to secure deletion of an item opposing "atheism" and adding items of racial discrimination, Orthodoxy in areas of rapid social change and the contributions of Orthodoxy to peace, liberty and love among people.

Background: Addressing the 22nd CPSU Congress on 17 October, Khrushchev included some statements and figures in an effort to show how Soviet agriculture had already contributed and would continue to contribute its part during the "entry of the Soviet Union into the period of the comprehensive construction of Communism". He said, inter alia, that "our reserves are vast; they will make it possible, in the next few years -- as the decisions of the January plenum noted -- to increase... meat 13 million tons and milk to 50 million tons a year." "Over the past five-year period the gross output of agriculture has increased, compared with the preceding five-year period, by 43 percent. The output of grain, meat, milk and other agricultural products has increased considerably." In order to arrive at this favorable picture of Soviet agriculture Khrushchev has omitted facts, juggled figures, and uttered platitudes for the future. Soviet agriculture, stagnant under Stalin, did increase 50% between 1953 and 1958 -- and although this signifies a real increase, the percentage jump is large, and to that extent misleading, only because the base year for measurement (1953) was so low in yield. Further, when Khrushchev speaks of the 43% increase of the last five years, he refers to the 1956-1961 period which included two exceptionally good years (which are also included in the 1953-1958 span), followed by three poor years. The use of five-year periods, rather than individual years, is a transparent attempt to conceal the failure of these recent years. Moreover, the increased production of 1957 and 1958 were the result of a special, all out agricultural effort in the virgin lands, favored by unusual weather, which could not be repeated. What has not been said is that the harvest reaped in those two years is probably in part responsible for the subsequent decline, -- the soil was exploited and not renewed; the machinery was hard used and not maintained; the manpower from the cities was thrown in for quick returns and was not maintained at the same level; and Mother Nature could not be expected, by all predictive criteria, to continue the unusual weather which favored the 1957-1958 harvests. (US output per person employed in agriculture has increased to-thirds during the last decade.)

The statements by Khrushchev, noted above, were inconsistent with some he made to the party central committee plenum last January (which had met to discuss agricultural problems) when he described agriculture as "out of step" with industry and the demands of the consumer, and called for organizational changes, an increase in agricultural investment, and the introduction of new material incentives for improving the quality of farm production. In the 17 October speech, it should be noted, Khrushchev did make a number of references to agricultural shortcomings of the USSR. He spoke, for example, of "the mistakes and shortcomings in the leadership of collective and state farms" and of the necessity of overcoming "in a short period the backwardness in agriculture". "We shall," he said, "have to, as it were, shake up some people in some places, clean up the pores a little, as the frequenters of bathhouses do, to enable the body to make a more normal use of oxygen." And, showing only too clearly the lack of understanding at the highest level in the Soviet Union


20 November 1961

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

of agricultural problems, Khrushchev made this revealing statement: "And what is the solution to the animal husbandry problem? It is primarily to increase meat, milk and butter production." In other words, the solution to the animal husbandry problem is to solve the animal husbandry problem. Pravda on 2 October (just before Khrushchev's speech) said: "Results of work done on kolkhozes (collective farms) and sovkhozes (state farms) have been comprehensively analyzed and shortcomings decisively disclosed at the congresses of union republics. . . . As a result, the country is not receiving a considerable quantity of meat and milk. . . . Winter comes even earlier on the virgin lands of Kazakhstan than in the Ukraine. But here, too, not everything has been readied to meet the winter. The plan for constructing livestock shelters has been fulfilled by only several percent. Hundreds of cow sheds and pigsties have no roofs, and tens of thousands of hectares of straw has not yet been gathered into ricks. . . ."

Farm output is supposed in the Soviet Union to rise at 8 percent per annum -- probably an unattainable rate. The grain target originally fixed for 1960 was 180 million tons; it was later postponed to 1965. As for Khrushchev's boasts not long ago that the USSR would outproduce the US in meat, milk and butter by 1961, he is now talking about outproducing the US by 1980, and in arriving at his fanciful figures he never seems to allow for expansion in the US production rate.

One Soviet agricultural problem is that of over expansion -- overloading the land and expecting too much of it. The typical Soviet response to agricultural failures is to blame organizations and individuals. (The Chinese Communists, on the other hand, choose to blame the weather.) Infatuation with gigantism has made the Soviet farms too large to be efficient economic units, and failure to understand the nature of agriculture as a biological process, with inherent uncontrollable elements, has led to attempts to establish factory-type methods and organizations. A basic distrust of individual initiative and enterprise has made it impossible to decentralize decision-making effectively.



25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Background: The World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) is scheduled to meet in Moscow December 4-16 to discuss and approve a program of world-wide trade union action previously adopted by the WFTU Executive Bureau at a meeting held in Prague 23-26 June 1961. The program was subsequently published as a supplement to the August 1961 issue of The World Trade Union Movement. On 30 July, Radio Moscow broadcast the text of the 1961 Draft Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), subsequently presented to the 22nd Congress of the CPSU convening in Moscow 17 October 1961, and adopted with only minor changes. V. V. Grishin, Soviet Vice-President of WFTU, is a candidate member of the new Presidium, elected at the 22nd CPSU Congress.

The World Peace Council is now scheduled to meet in Stockholm 16-20 December and has announced its intention of enlisting the support of trade unions everywhere in a new "Peace" campaign.

On 22-24 September, 1961, the International Trade Union Conference for a German Peace Treaty, a Peaceful Solution of the Problem of West Berlin and Against Military Provocations was held in East Berlin.

Reports emanating from Poland, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria indicate increased Communist Party dissatisfaction with the role local labor unions and workers have been playing in furthering Communist political aims, and with their "pre-occupation" with labor rights and interests.

The Draft Program for the Fifth World Trade Union Congress (See Book Dispatch #2798 and attachment) demonstrated primary concern for the role WFTU should play as a tool of the CPSU, being larded with communist propaganda lines on such issues as "peace", "anti-colonialism", "anti-imperialism", "peaceful coexistence" and the like. Extracts from the Draft Program for the 22nd CPSU Congress (see "Khrushchev's Blueprint for Communist Conquest", distributed with Book Dispatch #2776, indexed under Labor/Labor Parties and Trade Unions) and statements made at the East Berlin meeting in September (see attachment) clearly show the intended role of labor unions in the Communist scheme of things. The consecutive timing of the 22nd CPSU Congress and the Fifth Trade Union Congress is obviously no accident. The WFTU is being called to Moscow to hear the doctrine laid down at the 22nd Congress and to receive appropriate instructions. It is also likely that a delegation will be selected to attend the Stockholm meeting of the World Peace Council, which follows immediately after the WFTU meeting.

Since the withdrawal of the non-Communist unions from WFTU in 1948 (the Draft Program launches a campaign to entice them back) there was never open controversy at any WFTU international meeting over the adoption of a

20 November 1961

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040010-6
program previously approved by the Executive Bureau, and Then, at the 11th Session of the General Council of WFTU held in Peking, sharp conflict flared up between the Soviet and Chinese trade union leaders, despite the presence at the meeting of numerous leaders from non-Communist unions. This conflict has not since been resolved. In view of clear evidence of Moscow-Peking disagreement at the 22nd CPSU Congress and subsequently, it is highly possible that the rift will be reflected at the 5th World Labor Congress in December.

25X1C10b

459. Khrushchev Undermines his Standing - At Home and in the World

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Background: In many respects, the attacks on Stalin at the 22nd CPSU Congress hardly went as far as those made in Khrushchev's Secret Speech at the 20th Congress. Speakers spent more time accusing the Albanians and the "anti-party" group of Stalinism than on the attacks on the dead dictator himself. But unlike the situation in 1956, the anti-Stalin speeches at the 22nd CPSU Congress were broadcast, almost immediately, for all the world to hear. Since the Congress, Stalin's body has been removed from the Lenin-Stalin mausoleum, and streets, provinces, and cities -- even historic Stalingrad itself -- have been renamed. Stalin has now been officially degraded before everyone, including many Soviet citizens and non-Soviet Communists who did not know of the earlier attacks, or who refused to believe in them. Even this summer young visitors to Moscow from Ghana returned home wearing Stalin buttons. Many non-Soviet Communists have kept Stalin's picture on their walls to this day. During this very same Congress efforts have been made, despite attacks on the "personality cult", to establish Khrushchev as the fountain of Communist wisdom. (See Attachment) Only one foreign Communist, Chou En-lai, dared to criticize Khrushchev, if only implicitly, and his criticism was that non-Soviet parties should not be criticized in public.

It is true that Khrushchev's cult is not the same as Stalin's was. The difference in the types of ovations given them reflects this. But it is Khrushchev who is more truly, more typically Communist. Stalin borrowed from his Caucasian heritage, from the images of Tsarist history, and from Hitler and Mussolini, so that he combined with Communism the characteristics of Georgian conspiracy and brutality, Romanov autocracy, and Fascist irrationalism. Khrushchev on the other hand uses the concept of "collective leadership" in the same way that Communists use such other concepts as "peace", "freedom", "democracy", "disarmament", or "working class", -- that is, deceptively. The Khrushchev approach and the Stalin approach each has its advantages. Khrushchev, exploiting a term which is everywhere regarded as "good", is more difficult to attack; he specializes in the manipulation of verbal symbols. Stalin, on the other hand, appealed to revolutionary romanticism and Russian tradition; he was a "father image", an all-powerful, if also terrible, god. In casting off all ties with Stalin, Khrushchev has probably weakened a movement which depends largely on irrational appeals.

Every individual or group has what might be called a "credit rating", not only in the sense of financial soundness, but also in the sense of general repute for reliability, truthfulness, and trustworthiness. In politics, too, it is important to keep faith. The successful candidate may not always carry out his campaign promises, but he is vulnerable to attack if he does not; if not entirely honest, he is likely at least to carry out his pledges to those who have contributed to his campaign fund. If he is a machine candidate, or the representative of a closed party organization (like the Communist), he will keep faith with the

20 November 1961

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

organization. Credit is especially important in international politics; the diplomat must guard his reputation for reporting faithfully what he is told, and a power must fulfill its commitments, even at the cost of war, if it is to remain a power. Of course, some people manage to maintain a higher credit rating than they deserve by concealing their failures and falsifications, but such persons, if they are wise, do not suddenly start shouting that all their old friends are crooks. They do not, for example, tell all the customers that the grocery firm they now head used to put sand in the sugar. Since last March Khrushchev has been recklessly damaging his foreign political credit -- refusing to continue serious negotiations for a test control ban, launching a new Berlin crisis (with a deadline, since modified), and starting a new series of atmospheric nuclear tests, obviously well-prepared in advance. Now, with his public de-Stalinization campaign, he has further destroyed his credit, at home as well as abroad. For many Communists, both inside and outside the Soviet Union, he has been breaking down the idol in which they had a vested interest, namely, the monolithic, international, revolutionary elite party, moving in a straight line across history. The fact that Stalin had his hard, terroristic side made those who accepted him as their leader all the more firmly committed to him, and for years they have defended him. Not only is Khrushchev now eating his own words, he is forcing all the others who once praised Stalin to eat their own words too. Loyal Communists will swallow a great deal, but it is hard for anyone to swallow being made a fool of in the eyes of his enemies.

There is also another problem, that of the long-term goals of the movement. Khrushchev has expended a great deal of energy in presenting Soviet communism as the "wave of the future". But he has done much himself to undercut the appeal of Communism as the pattern of tomorrow. Where religious faith has weakened, the universal longing for immortality usually takes the form of a desire to leave some lasting memorial to one's life work: the ordinary citizen finds immortality in planning for his own children's future, or in participating in a social movement; the more ambitious person hopes to leave a name in history, or at least to be respected by that group (profession, party, neighborhood) to which he belongs. These desires are thwarted by the leader who rewrites history. Will the local party leader be written off, despite loyal service, because he was associated with a Trotskyite faction or with an "anti-Party group"? Will children be barred from a university because their father had the wrong political associations? If as mighty a man as Stalin once was can be removed from his tomb, and his name stricken from its walls, what is there that is lasting?

25X1C10b

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Background: Khrushchev's public and definitive denunciation of the person and deeds of Joseph Stalin came as a surprise not only to the West, but also to the foreign delegates to the 22nd CPSU Congress, some of whom a few days earlier, upon their arrival, had dutifully decorated the bier of the defunct dictator. This open condemnation of the "errors and distortions" of the Stalinist era from the dais of the 22nd CPSU Congress will certainly have an important long range influence on the people of the USSR and East Europe and on their attitude toward communism. The rationale behind this decision, which casts doubt upon an entire era, must have been of over-riding importance. Mr. Khrushchev stated these reasons to the Congress:

"What would have happened to our country if the personality cult had not been condemned, its evil consequences not overcome, and Lenin's principles of party and state activities not restored? This would have threatened the divorcing of the party from the masses and from the people, serious violations of Soviet democracy and revolutionary legality, a slowing down of economic development of the country, a reduction of the rate of communist construction and therefore of the improvement of the working people's well-being. In the field of international relations this would have led to a weakening of the Soviet Union's position in the world arena, to a deterioration of relations with other countries, which would be fraught with grave consequences."

In other words, the de-Stalinization campaign was related first of all to internal policies. To build a Communist society in the USSR during the next twenty years requires the continued effort and cooperation of the Russian people. Obviously, this cannot be accomplished by a party "divorced from the masses". Nor, as Khrushchev has taken pains to point out, can it be accomplished by "violations of Soviet democracy and revolutionary legality", i. e., by coercion and terror, since this would "reduce the rate of Communist construction". Rather the Soviet leaders feel they must now rely more on incentive and less on police repression, and are attempting therefore to equate the new millenium of communism with more freedom, more consumer goods, even with some degree of democracy within the party. Thus, by publicly exposing Stalin's crimes, Khrushchev appears to be telling the people of the Soviet Union (and by extension the people of East Europe), that coercion - at least in its former blatant and arbitrary form - belongs to a period of Soviet society which is irrevocably gone. The removal of Stalin's body from its place of honor and the obliteration of all the reminders of Stalin's presence are being used to demonstrate in a graphic and unforgettable manner that such violations belong to

a Stalinist past, the very memory of which is being erased from the pages of Soviet Russia's history. Concomitantly, Khrushchev has sought to establish once and for all, the validity of his internal program, warning the Stalinist diehards at home that their foot-dragging would no longer be tolerated.

Within a Communist bloc context, there is the explicit condemnation of Enver Hoxha and, implicit in this, a much larger and more important target, the condemnation of Mao and Communist China. Apparently, Khrushchev felt that the time for a showdown with the Chinese had arrived; thus the denunciation of Stalin and the cult of personality in general can be interpreted as an attempt to reaffirm Moscow's position as the sole interpreter of orthodoxy for the Communist world. Here, Khrushchev probably did not count on Peking's acquiescence but must have decided the time had come to expose the Chinese heresy and bring about its isolation from the rest of the bloc. Moreover, by excommunicating Hoxha, Khrushchev warned the rest of the Eastern bloc that such heresies would no longer be tolerated. He also reminded the satellite leaders that an era of "Khrushchevian Communism" was being inaugurated and that the courses of action which it stands for are expected to be carried out in practice and not merely paid lip service to.

Externally, Khrushchev tells us that if the Stalinist group had been in power, there would have been a "deterioration of relations with other countries" and a "weakening of the Soviet Union's position in the world arena", thereby emphasizing the validity of his own program for handling relations with the West and the neutralists. In other words Khrushchev has strongly reaffirmed his thesis of "peaceful coexistence" and the more subtle and oblique methods which it encompasses (if compared with Stalin's, Molotov's, or Mao's diplomatic concepts), as the only accepted method of advancing communism.

While it is difficult to predict what particular form the reaction to Khrushchev's latest de-Stalinization campaign will take in East Europe, there are already indications of the Satellite leaders' concern with this development. A high-ranking Polish official predicts renewed public pressure in Poland for greater freedom and, within the party itself, the reappearance of revisionism. In this connection, a recent article by member of the Central Committee Secretariat Zambrowski called for a higher degree of democracy within the party. In Bulgaria, a satellite known for its Stalinist predilections, the government announced on 4 November that all projects and locations bearing the name of Stalin would be renamed for Lenin. In East Germany, where Khrushchev's denunciation of the cult of the individual must have a particular ominous ring for the party stalwarts, Ulbricht, who returned from the 22nd Congress in a subdued and chastened mood, is belatedly also beginning de-Stalinization; he announced, that as far as Germany was concerned, the cult of the individual existed - as everyone could plainly see - solely around the person of that arch-revanchist in West Germany, Konrad Adenauer.

460. (Cont.)

~~SECRET~~

November 1961

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

What then is likely to be the effect of Khrushchev's pronouncements on the Communist regimes and the peoples of East Europe? In a word, disillusion for the one and a resurgence of hope for the other. While dramatic upheavals of the type experienced in 1956 are unlikely, the long range effect on East Europe of Khrushchev's campaign against Stalin and his ghostly remnants may be considerable. Bearing in mind Khrushchev's statement to the 21st Congress that the bloc will enter the Communist millenium together, there is every reason to argue that the Communist leaders as well as the people of East Europe have a basis for interpreting Khrushchev's promise that incentives will replace coercion as applying equally to them.

25X1C10b

NOTE: This is a first, comprehensive, but unavoidably summary guidance dealing with the complex issues resulting from the Congress, prepared b e f o r e all relevant information has been received, let alone fully analyzed. [REDACTED]

25X1C10b

REFERENCES:

- (a) Guidance #421, 28 August 1961, "The Draft of the New CPSU Program."
- (b) Guidance #425, 11 September 1961, "The Reality of Sino-Soviet Tensions."
- (c) Guidance #426, 11 September 1961, "The 22nd CPSU Congress"
- (d) Book Dispatch #2776, 31 August 1961, "Draft of CPSU Program" (with UNCLASSIFIED staff study, "Khrushchev's Blueprint for Communist Conquest").

25X1C10b

Background: Preparations for the 22nd CPSU Congress, held 17-31 October in Moscow, strongly indicated that it was originally intended to serve three principal purposes:

- a. To restore the position of the CPSU--and its leader Khrushchev--to the top of the World Communist Movement (a position somewhat shaken by the Moscow Declaration of 81 Communist Parties, November 1960), especially through adoption of a new program;
- b. To complete Khrushchev's mastery of the domestic party and government apparatus, mainly by means of changes in party statutes and by electing a Central Committee composed of his henchmen;
- c. To strengthen Khrushchev's foreign policy, especially in the Berlin crisis, by a show of internal strength and international unity at the Congress, accompanied by external, dramatic features such as new space "spectaculars", etc.

Actually, the proceedings of the Congress, while demonstrating Khrushchev's supremacy within the CPSU and forcefully expressing his and the party's claim to hegemony in the World Communist Movement, did not accomplish all the above ends:

~~SECRET~~

(Continued)

a. The "space spectaculars" did not materialize: on the contrary, Gagarin's odd disappearance, allegedly into a hospital, explained by a mysterious automobile accident and Titov's admitted space-sickness, while in orbit, have aroused suspicions that the first two Soviet men in space may have to pay with their health, if not with their lives, for Khrushchev's propaganda victories.

b. The immediate impact of the ambitious new party program was considerably reduced by the unprecedented attacks against the Albanian Communist party leaders and against the "anti-party group", Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov, and others, within the CPSU, first voiced by Khrushchev and repeated by numerous speakers, including a number of foreign delegates, although by no means all.

c. These attacks officially publicized Sino-Soviet tensions, hardly mentioned in public by any official Communist source heretofore, with large-scale publicity by the Communists themselves, underlined Khrushchev's denunciation of the Albanians, Chou-En-Lai's premature departure from the Congress, and the Albanian CP's angry denunciation of Khrushchev as a "splitter and underminer of international Communism".

d. Khrushchev and other speakers denounced Stalin for various crimes and errors: unlike the 20th Congress, where such denunciations had been limited to a secret session (still not disclosed to the general Soviet public), it was done this time in public session and reported by mass media; this led to the removal of Stalin's body from Lenin's side (but he was re-buried at the Kremlin wall, with other Communist "heroes") and Khrushchev spoke of a monument to be erected in honor of Stalin's victims.

e. Election of the new Central Committee increased the number of full members from 133 to 175 and the number of candidates from 122 to 156. Of the total, approximately 200 are reported to be new (i. e. Khrushchev's handpicked followers), while only about 125 full and candidate members were re-elected. The Presidium, meanwhile, was reduced from 14 full and 9 candidate members to 11 full and 5 candidate members. The Secretariat, however, was expanded from 5 to 9 secretaries (comparable to cabinet members in a democracy). Perhaps the most significant changes in the Presidium and Secretariat are: Mme Furtseva, the only woman member, and Mr. Mukhitdinov, the only member of Asian origin, were dropped from the Presidium (though re-elected to the Central Committee); among the new Secretaries are Shelepin, formerly Intelligence (KGB) Chief, Ponomarev, head of the International Department in the Central Committee staff, and Ilichev, head of the Agitprop department in that staff.

g. Discipline in the Communists ranks, within the CPSU as well as throughout the International movement, is obviously suffering -- heavily as a result of these several conflicts and of the "final" down-grading of Stalin, still venerated as leader, teacher and "father image" by millions inside and outside the Soviet Union. Doubts about how far this new purge will go are likely to weaken further the cohesion within Communist parties.

The Congress was by far the largest and most-prosperous-looking CPSU convention ever held: 4,408 voting and 405 non-voting delegates participated (the key for electing delegates had been changed from 5,000 to 2,000 members, thus increasing them by 250%) plus sizeable delegations from about 80 foreign Communist parties; the sessions were held in a modernistic new theater, equipped with all the latest conveniences, erected within the Kremlin walls and completed just in time for the Congress. The affluence of the new Communist ruling class was shown by numerous cars put at the disposal of the high-ranking delegates; all participants were offered theatrical performances, special exhibitions and other tangible status symbols.

The world viewed the Congress against the doubly ominous background of the Berlin crisis and of the largest series of Soviet nuclear tests, climaxed (but not ended, contrary to Khrushchev's announcement) with a 50 megaton explosion. Khrushchev omitted the 31 December deadline for the conclusion of a peace treaty with East Germany (provided the West could convince him in the meantime that it was willing to negotiate "seriously", i.e. accept at least some of Khrushchev's major demands). This vagueness about the deadline -- contrasting with previous reports, alleging that the treaty was to be signed immediately after, or even before, the CPSU Congress -- plus the new wave of "Anti-Stalinism" may have worried East German CP boss Ulbricht, who has always been Stalin's obedient servant and who is still ruling East Germany in the worst Stalinist tradition. There were, however, no indications that Khrushchev was willing to "soften" his demands on Berlin. On the contrary, a number of "hard actions" in Berlin, his sharp note to Finland (demanding consultation on West German "threats of aggression") and his announcement that he might continue nuclear tests "indefinitely", if the US would dare to follow his example and undertake atmospheric tests, leave little hope for an early reduction of the (Khrushchev-originated) international tensions. 25X1C10b

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Next 4 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Background:

a. General: International Communism's support and direction of the Vietnamese Communist guerrilla forces (Viet Cong) operating in South Vietnam has its roots in clearly enunciated Communist doctrine, despite the Communist claim that the Viet Cong are purely local South Vietnamese patriots seeking liberation from the "colonialist regime of DIEM".

b. Communist Doctrine: That the Communists have advertised their intent to mount guerrilla warfare under the guise of support to national wars of liberation is clearly revealed in the following material.

(1) The Moscow Manifesto of December 1960, signed by 81 Communist Parties, including the Chinese, stated:

"The national liberation movement receives powerful support from the international working class movement... Communists have always recognized the progressive, revolutionary significance of national liberation wars; they are the most active champions of national independence... They will do the utmost for the people to weaken imperialism and limit its sphere of action by an active struggle for peace, democracy and national liberation."

(2) Khrushchev, on 6 January 1961, in a speech commenting on the Moscow meeting which adopted the above Manifesto made it clear that the ultimate extension of international communism's support of national liberation wars is active assistance to the Viet Cong guerrillas. He stated:

"Now about national liberation wars. Recent examples of wars of this kind are the armed struggle waged by the people of Vietnam... The communists support just wars of this kind wholeheartedly and without reservations and they march in the van of the peoples fighting for liberation."

~~SECRET~~

(3) The CPTU Program adopted at the recently concluded
Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6
22nd Congress stated that:

"The Socialist countries are sincere and true friends of peoples fighting for their liberation and of those that have freed themselves from imperialist tyranny and render them all-around support."

In Khrushchev's 18 October report on this program, two short paragraphs after stating "communists are opponents of a forcible, artificial implantation of this or that social political system in other countries...and will not seek victory by interfering in the internal affairs of other countries", he states:

"The people of one country or another who rise to fight will not find themselves alone in the struggle against world imperialism. Powerful international forces are at their side, having at their disposal all that is necessary to give effective moral and material support."

Khrushchev concluded treatment of this subject by stating:

"Communists are against the export of revolution, and this is well known to the West".

(4) Keeping in mind that the Communists mean the West and nations friendly to it when they speak of imperialism, it becomes clear from the above that their announced policy is to provide all means of support to any who will rise up against a non-Communist government. Additionally, the Communist claim that they do not advocate "export of revolution" is ridiculous in view of their repeated promises to support "national liberation wars" which elsewhere in their doctrine, are the announced final objectives of their "united front". In a few words, Mr. W.W. Rostow, Special Asst. to the President, summed up all the above in the New Leader article. (See Press Comment, August 1961) Speaking of Khrushchev's 6 January speech (paragraph (2) above), Rostow noted:

"Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev...explained at great length that the Communists fully support what he called wars of national liberation and would march in the front rank with the peoples waging such struggles. The military arm of Khrushchev's doctrine is clearly guerrilla warfare."

c. Communist Rules of Conduct for the Guerrilla: the Communists attach overriding importance to the notion that the guerrilla, if he is to survive, if he is to win recruits, must be the friend of the local inhabitants and engage in no excesses. MAO is most frequently quoted as identifying this important relationship:¹

¹ Mao Tse-tung, "Problems in the Guerrilla War of Resistance Against Japan" 1939

~~SECRET~~

(continued)

"The people are like water and the army is like fish. How can it be difficult for the fish to survive if they immerse themselves within the mass of the water. But if the water is taken away or dries up, the fish must also die and pass away. All guerrillas must think hard and fully understand this basic truth..."

Chu Te, now Chairman of the National People's Congress of the Chicom regime wrote:¹

"The masses must be both the base and mother of guerrillas and a guerrilla force divorced from the people is like a fish out of water whose death is imminent... To insure the sympathy of the people, guerrillas must adhere to strict discipline and the customs and traditions of the people must be respected."

"Che" Guevara, one of Fidel Castro's chief Communist lieutenants, writes:²

"The guerrilla must have rigid self-control...avoid a single excess, a single act of misbehavior, even when circumstances would permit and disturb the rich as little as possible in the first of the development of the war. But the war will follow its course. The contradictions will become increasingly sharp and a moment will come when many of those that view the revolution with some sympathy will take a position diametrically opposed...At that moment the guerrilla must act and become the standard bearer of the popular cause, punishing justly all treason... Sabotage has nothing to do with terrorism. Terrorism and personal assassination are absolutely different phases. We sincerely believe that it is a negative weapon which produces in no way the desired effects, which can turn people against a given revolutionary movement."

d. Terrorist Tactics of the Viet Cong: Contrary to the doctrine that the guerrilla is the friend of the people, it is estimated that 400 to 500 citizens of South Vietnam are murdered each month by the Viet Cong guerrillas. While the regular forces of South Vietnam have suffered many casualties, the Viet Cong, with the obvious objective of eroding government at the village level, concentrate their attacks on killing village chiefs, public health administrators, nurses,

¹Chu Te, On Guerrilla Warfare, Shanghai, 1939.

²Che Guevara, La Guerra de Guerrillas, Havana, 1960.

462. (Cont.)

teachers, and local self defense part-time militia. This program of assassination at the gross roots level is greatly enhanced by the Soviet airlift of supplies to southeastern Laos from which regular North Vietnam forces, disguised as Viet Cong, infiltrate into central South Vietnam reinforcing the ranks of the Viet Cong and assuring them a steady flow of arms and ammunitions. The savagery of Viet Cong terrorist tactics was dramatically revealed on 17 October 1961 with the discovery of Colonel Hoang Thuy NAM's mutilated body. Colonel NAM, South Vietnam's chief liaison officer with the International Control Commission (ICC) was kidnapped by the Viet Cong on or about 10 October. An examination of his body revealed that he had been severely tortured prior to being murdered by the Viet Cong. For details concerning outraged South Vietnam's reaction to Colonel NAM's assassination see New York Times 20 October 1961 (Press Comment 20 October) and New York Times, 25 October 1961 (Press Comment 25 October).

25X1C10b

25X1C10b

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6

Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev was born on 17 April 1894 in Kalinovka, a Russian village a few miles from the Ukrainian border. It is possible, though not proven, that his father may have been one Sergei Nikolayevich Khrushchev, a landowner in Kalinovka who was also an official in the Tsarist Ministry of Interior, and who is said to have been discharged and deprived of his land for anti-tsarist activity. Nikita worked as a young man in the Don Basin of the Ukraine; according to his own remarks made on various occasions, he held various jobs as a coal miner, a harvest laborer, a worker in a chemical factory, a fitter, and an iron-worker. During the 1914-1918 war, he somehow managed to evade military service in the tsar's army, but he joined the Red Guards in March 1918. It is probable that this was his first political action, and his forceful personality and speaking ability soon made him party secretary of his regiment. In 1920, Khrushchev again became a worker, and soon began to rise in the lower ranks of the party. He had previously only learned to read and write, but in 1922 he entered one of the so-called "workers' faculties" three-year secondary schools. His mind uncluttered by bourgeois education, he soaked up the principles of Marxism-Leninism. On finishing his training, he became a full-time party apparatchik in the city of Stalino (now Donetsk) in the Don Basin of the Ukraine. Kaganovich was at this time Secretary-General of the Party in the Ukraine and became Khrushchev's sponsor; by 1928, Khrushchev was taking part in secret meetings of the Ukrainian party leadership, concerned with emergency measures arising from production difficulties in the Don Basin. When Kaganovich was promoted to a position in Moscow, Khrushchev was promoted to a position in Kiev. Speeches by Khrushchev in this period reflect merely a complete loyalty to the party leadership, and a stress on developing the powers of the professional party workers as opposed to the non-professional party committees. In 1929-31, Khrushchev spent a year and a half in the J. V. Stalin Industrial Academy in Moscow, but he left without completing his course to become a rayon Secretary in Moscow, under Kaganovich. According to one source, he was lucky enough to meet Stalin's second wife, Nadezhda Allilueva, and she passed on to him her position as party secretary at the school. In January 1932 he became second secretary of Moscow City, in other words Kaganovich's deputy. According to one source, partly supported by an article in a Ukrainian paper in 1938, Khrushchev had first attracted Kaganovich's attention by making anti-Trotsky speeches in 1923.

By 1932, if not before, Khrushchev had come to know Stalin, who was--aside from his higher offices--a member of the Moscow City party committee. Khrushchev's abilities as a clown, his proficiency at dancing the gopak, may have given him some social entree into Stalin's entourage. Certainly he demonstrated his serious talents as a straw boss who "could get the work out" in the construction of the first section of the Moscow subway. He had already had experience in pushing production under dangerous working conditions in the Don Basin in the period of the Shakhty trials, and it is very likely this ability which explains his rise in the Ukrainian apparatus, his appointment to the J. V. Stalin Academy, his departure from that academy for party work in Moscow, and his rapid rise in that apparatus. Like his master, Kaganovich, he was a "trouble shooter", a man who could crack down on subordinates at a time when purge and the threat of purge were essential instruments of party control. He spoke, praising Stalin and Kaganovich, at the 17th Congress of the CPSU in 1934, and in 1935 became First Secretary of the Moscow City and Oblast party organizations. Although not an official on the national level, this position in the capital meant that he was in effect a member of the top levels of the Soviet leadership.

In both his secret speech of 25 February 1956 and his public speech at the 22nd Congress on 27 October 1961, Khrushchev described the reign of terror which began after the mysterious murder of Sergei Kirov on 1 December 1934. In 1956 he pointed out that top officials of the Leningrad NKVD had been given light sentences at first, but then in 1937 had been shot: "We can assume," Khrushchev said, "that they were shot in order to cover the traces of the organizers of Kirov's killing." And in 1961, he asked, "Why were both officials of the NKVD, escorting Kirov's chief bodyguard, shot later? This means that someone needed to have them liquidated to remove all traces."

Evidently the "someone" was Stalin. In his secret speech, Khrushchev said: "After the criminal murder of S. M. Kirov, mass repression and brutal acts of violation of Socialist legality began. On the evening of 1 December 1934, on Stalin's initiative (without the approval of the Political Bureau--which was given two days later, casually) the Secretary of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee, Yenukidze," signed a directive for speeding up trials and executions. Khrushchev can claim to have come out against Yenukidze at an earlier date, in 1935. But his reasons then were different; on 13 June 1935, Pravda reported a Khrushchev speech to a group of Moscow activists as follows:

The active listened with special attention to the second part of the report which dealt with the official apparatus of the Secretariat of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR and with Yenukidze. A few months ago in this same hall of the Conservatoire, the sad news of the murder of Sergei Mironovich Kirov struck the Moscow active like a thunderbolt. The shot which struck Comrade Kirov showed that our enemies stop at nothing. Exposed and maddened, they resort to any kind of foul deed, from setting fire to kolkhoz sheepfolds, poisoning food in workers' canteens to murder of the leaders of the people. All the necessary deductions should have been drawn from this signal. Yenukidze, however, having lost all the qualities of a Bolshevik, preferred to be a "kind uncle" to the enemies of our party."

In other words, instead of violating socialist legality, Yenukidze was showing too much concern for it. Let the 1935 Khrushchev continue:

"Comrade Khrushchev spoke about the contamination of the official apparatus of the Secretariat of the Central Executive Committee, and about the political and moral degeneration of Yenukidze, who had allowed the sworn enemies of the working class to penetrate into it.

The Party showed great trust in Yenukidze, giving him responsible work to do, said Comrade Khrushchev, but he did not justify that trust. He betrayed the cause of the revolution. He degenerated politically and morally. Even in the plenum of the Central Committee of the Party he spoke not like a Communist but like a bad business manager, a petty bourgeois, a degenerate. His expulsion from the ranks of the party proves once again that the Bolsheviks show no mercy to anyone who flouts the responsibilities of a Communist.

To thunderous applause from the whole hall, Comrade Khrushchev appealed for still greater vigilance, for a fight against rotten liberalism, for a still greater closing of the ranks of the Moscow Bolsheviks around the Central Committee and the Leader of the Party, Comrade Stalin."

In calling for "still greater vigilance, for a fight against rotten liberalism", Khrushchev was then furthering the campaign of "mass repression and brutal acts of violation of Socialist legality" which he denounced in 1956. Moreover, one must wonder if, in thus attacking Yenukidze, he was not knowingly helping Stalin in the liquidation of a man who knew too much. Yenukidze, like the two NKVD officials, was shot in 1937.

The Ukrainian CP had, in Stalin's eyes, begun to develop dangerous nationalist (i.e., Ukrainian nationalist) tendencies. In August 1937, Pravda announced that a special commission, composed of Molotov, Yezhov (the head of the NKVD), and Khrushchev was coming to investigate the situation at Kiev. The commission was preceded by an NKVD contingent, which placed the Ukrainian party leadership under guard. Molotov demanded that the Ukrainian party organization accept Khrushchev as its new First Secretary. The Ukrainian Central Committee bravely rejected this demand, but did (with one exception) accept a second demand that they come to Moscow to confer with Stalin. (The exception, Panas Lyubchenko, committed suicide.)

As a result of the trip, all the members of the Ukrainian Politburo were at least arrested, while all the members of the Orgburo and the Control Commission died. The three secretaries of the Ukrainian party, Kosior, Khataevich, and Popov, lost their lives. (At the 22nd Congress in 1961 Khrushchev said Kosior "perished innocently"; he does not seem to have said so in 1937.) Of 62 members and 40 candidate members of the Ukrainian Central Committee, all but two were purged. Then, on 28 January 1938, Pravda announced that the plenum of the Ukrainian Central Committee (actually non-existent at this point) had named Khrushchev as its new First Secretary. Khrushchev's appointment was made more legal in June 1938, when a Congress of the Ukrainian party was held. At this Congress, Khrushchev told his audience: "The enemies of the people, the bourgeois nationalists... removed the Russian language from the school curriculum.... Comrades, now all the peoples will learn Russian".

It appears that Khrushchev's Russification policy did not confine itself to linguistic training. In 1943, while the Nazis were in occupation, a Ukrainian doctor caused some digging in an area which had been fenced off by the NKVD near Vinnitsa, in the Central Ukraine. Eventually 95 mass graves were discovered, containing 9,439 victims. 1390 bodies were discovered buried in the Gorky Park of Culture and Rest. Of the victims, 676 were identified: they included 212 peasants, 82 workers, 51 government officials, 26 specialists, 16 soldiers and 4 priests. The graves were investigated by an international commission, and photographs made which were displayed in New York in 1954. Relatives identified some of the bodies in 1943 as those of people arrested for "nationalism" in late 1937 and 1938. The investigating experts concluded that the deaths had occurred between 1938 and 1940. It was during this period that Khrushchev became known as "the Hammer of the Ukraine". According to a report in an Armenian newspaper, published since the 22nd Congress, Malenkov was guilty of arresting more than 3500 prominent Armenians in a few months in 1937, many of whom were shot. The Reuters report states: "Bardamants /chief of the Armenian KGB/ told a Party meeting Tuesday in Yerevan, the Armenian capital, that in 1937 Malenkov was given the assignment of repressing the Republic's Party apparatus. This was after the Soviet secret police chief, Lavrenti Beria, had personally shot the Armenian Communist Party First Secretary." Actually, Malenkov was conducting the Armenian phase of the same purge of nationalists that Khrushchev was conducting in the Ukraine.

In the summer of 1940, after the fall of France, the Soviet Union bestirred itself to make some annexations of its own. Aside from absorbing the Baltic states, Moscow sent an ultimatum to Rumania, demanding the cession of Bukovina. The German Ambassador in Moscow, Count Schulenberg, sent a message to the German Foreign Ministry on 11 July 1940 stating:

"I cannot get rid of the impression that it was Ukrainian circles in the Kremlin who have advocated and put through the claim for cession of Northern Bukovina. On several occasions, as for instance during the negotiations regarding the German-Soviet border in Poland, a very strong Ukrainian influence in the Kremlin was evident. Herr Stalin told me personally at that time that he was prepared to make concessions north of the boundary line where it runs through White Russia, but this was impossible in the south where the Ukrainians live. Consequently, the cession of the city of Sinyava, very much desired by us, was cancelled by the Soviet Government after it had first agreed to it. It has not yet been possible to determine where this strong Ukrainian influence originates. There is no especially influential Ukrainian known to be among the immediate entourage of the leaders in the Kremlin."

Schulenberg speculated that the influence might be a minor official at that time in the Soviet Embassy in Berlin; Khrushchev would appear to be a likelier candidate. While Schulenberg appears to have been naive or disingenuous in reporting that there was a "very strong Ukrainian influence in the Kremlin", it is quite possible that, aside from strategic considerations, Khrushchev was arguing persuasively for an enlargement of the Ukraine, and that he may have been behind the reversal over the city of Sinyava. Stalin did not, of course, submit his decisions to a majority vote in the Politburo, but necessarily, he did work out decisions together with the officials who

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6
were most Bukovina, Khrushchev would have been one of those consulted.

In regard to Khrushchev's wartime career, volume 7 of the Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, issued in June 1951, only mentioned Khrushchev as tenth in a list of 14 wartime leaders; Malenkov was credited with organizing the defense of Stalingrad. But volume 22, issued in September 1953, ranked Khrushchev third in a list of 11 wartime political generals and industrial directors. Recent Soviet historiography plays down Khrushchev's role in the defeat of the Soviet army at Kiev, and plays up his role at Stalingrad (now Volgograd). Khrushchev's wartime activities are now virtually the only part of his pre-1953 history to get much Soviet attention; apparently he hopes, by concentrating on this phase, to depict himself as outside the inner circle of the party--as a participant in the glorious Patriotic War, but not a participant in Stalinist purges and repressions.

After 1943, as the Nazis withdrew, Khrushchev's primary responsibility was once again to rule the Ukraine. He took part in the planning of the new Polish regime, making his first trip outside the Soviet Union to Warsaw in 1945; shortly thereafter a Treaty of Alliance and Friendship was signed between Warsaw and Moscow. But Stalin never let any of his instruments become too secure. In 1946, Khrushchev was forced to move some of his own faithful followers from their positions. Then in March 1947, he himself was suddenly removed from his post and replaced by Kaganovich. A Malenkov man, N. S. Patolichev, was named as Ukrainian Second Secretary; it may be that this marks the point when Khrushchev resolved eventually to settle his scores with Kaganovich and with Malenkov. Fortunately for Khrushchev, he was restored as Ukrainian First Secretary (though not as Ukrainian Premier) in December 1947, and he set about restoring the damage to his personal machine. He was able, at a time when his rivals were engaged in infighting in the Kremlin, to build up a network of dependents in his large bailiwick. In December 1949, Khrushchev was transferred from the Ukraine to the post of Secretary of Moscow Oblast, which he had held in the 1930's. This gave him a valuable chance to extend his personal party machinery; it also brought him into daily contact with Stalin again.

Stalin's death has yet to be fully explained, but it came at a time when a number of the top leaders, and particularly Khrushchev, were in imminent danger of purge or worse. Now there was a succession problem. Who of the leadership--Malenkov, Beria, Molotov, and Khrushchev were the most prominent--would become dictator? At first it appeared that Malenkov would assume all of Stalin's powers, but within 9 days the others combined to take from him the title of First Secretary. Khrushchev has recently given an unofficial description of how in late June or early July 1953, he grappled with Beria, who was then machine-gunned by General Moskalenko. The fact that this explanation was not made at the 22nd Congress itself suggests that it was not endorsed by all the presidium, and that Khrushchev may have exaggerated his own role. At all events, Beria was eliminated. On 13 September 1953, Khrushchev succeeded in becoming First Secretary, an all-important success, which he had, however, to exploit cautiously. Malenkov was still Premier.

Pravda, under Khrushchev's control, began at the end of 1954 to return to praises of Stalin and to link Khrushchev with him; the party newspaper also argued for more stress on heavy industry, as against Malenkov's stress on consumer goods, and the idea that nuclear weapons had made wars too dangerous expressed by Malenkov's program, was attacked. On 25 January 1955, Khrushchev denounced Malenkov's program, speaking ominously of "rightist deviation, a regurgitation of views hostile to Leninism, views which Rykov, Bukharin and their like once preached. On 8 February Malenkov resigned his premiership. Possibly because the others demanded it, possibly for tactical reasons of his own, Khrushchev now began to shift from Stalinism to the advocacy of collective leadership. Instead of accusing his rivals of rightist deviation, he was soon implying that they were the Stalinists. But by 1957, the other party leaders were alarmed at Khrushchev's growing power, and a majority of the presidium members voted to demote Khrushchev from his post of First Secretary. Bulgenin, Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich, Pervukhin, Saburov and Shepilov all opposed Khrushchev. But Khrushchev's long years in control of the Ukraine

and the MoApproved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6
party organization, now yielded dividends. He was able to appeal to the Central
Committee, where a majority of members were his personal followers; he also
appealed to Marshal Zhukov for military protection for himself and his friends.
Once his position was made secure by a Central Committee vote, he wasted
little time in attacking his opponents as the "Anti-Party group", and took
care to get rid of Zhukov at the earliest opportunity. The name is of course
a typical Khrushchevian semantic club; Malenkov et al. were a group in that
they were all Communists--and ill opposed to Khrushchev--but in little else.
The name only makes sense if Khrushchev can say, paraphrasing Louis XIV,
"I am the party". Perhaps the essential purpose of the 22nd Congress was to
say this more loudly, to foreign as well as Soviet Communists.

Fifth World Trade Union Congress and Soviet Propaganda

The World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) is scheduled to meet in Moscow 4-16 December 1961 to discuss and approve a program of world-wide trade union action previously adopted by the WFTU Executive Bureau at a meeting held in Prague 23-26 June 1961. On 30 July 1961 Moscow Radio broadcast the text of the 1961 Draft Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) for the 22nd Congress of the CPSU, which was scheduled for and met in October 1961.

Since mid-September both the CPSU and the WFTU have placed a maximum amount of emphasis on the problem of Germany and the Berlin Crisis. To support the Soviet position the WFTU secretariat met with the Secretariat of the Free German Trade Union (FDGB) in East Berlin on 28-29 August 1961 to plan for an international trade union conference which could be used as a sounding board for Soviet propaganda. Accordingly from 22-24 September 1961 the International Trade Union Conference for the German Peace Treaty, Peaceful Solution of the Problem of West Berlin and Against Military Provocations was held in East Berlin.

East Berlin Union Conference: A letter from Khrushchev to the conference stated.

"I am confident that your conference called on the initiative of the World Trade Union Federation will undoubtedly play a major role in the mobilization of the working people and trade unions of Europe and the entire world for the active struggle for the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany, for a peaceful solution of the West German problem, against imperialist war provocations, for general and complete disarmament, and for stable peace and international security."

The Berlin conference issued a memorandum at its conclusion which restated the basic Soviet position in regard to Germany and Berlin. The conference also issued two appeals. One, addressed to the working people of all countries, contained the following statement:

"Working people of all countries:

Whatever your convictions and whatever trade union organizations you may belong to, your unity of action on an international scale is the main condition for the achievement of your common goals:

- the preservation of peace, which is now being threatened;
- general and complete disarmament, the only means of putting an end to the atomic threat and nuclear weapons tests;
- peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

By concerted struggle let us gain an urgent conclusion of a German peace treaty and the solution of the West Berlin problem through negotiation."

A second appeal was addressed to the working people and trade unions of West Germany and included the following:

"Working people of Western Germany, you cannot wish a repetition of Nazi crimes. Like we, you must realize that the conclusion of a German peace treaty is the best way to ensuring your own security and creating conditions favorable for the unification of Germany along peaceful and democratic lines. The peace treaty will be the most effective means of preserving peace in Europe and in the whole world. It will facilitate the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament, which the vast masses of working people are striving for. We call upon you to redouble your efforts and fight resolutely and jointly with us to achieve these aims.

"Wage your struggle at factories, construction projects and institutions, in towns and villages. Stop the hand of revenge-seekers and militarists.

"Work, in cooperation with your class brothers in the GDR and their trade unions, for the signing of a peace treaty with the two German states and the conversion of West Berlin into a free demilitarized city.

"Turn your trade unions into mighty bastions of struggle against military preparations.

"Fight against vile military propaganda, expose those who act as zealous agents of Nazi generals in the working-class movement.

"Fight for the implementation of decisions of your trade union congresses directed against the armament of the Bundeswehr and the preparation of war.

"Demand observance of trade union freedoms and democratic rights and an end to the persecution of the working people and all Democratic Peoples fighting for peace and disarmament.

"Realize the historical responsibility shouldered by you! Think of the grave responsibility that will rest with you if you fail to unite, if you leave in isolation those who are fighting courageously in your country! By not entering resolutely upon the path of struggle you would directly connive at the preparation of a new militarist provocation which would be the beginning of a terrible atomic war.

"The working people of all the world whom we represent are ready to support you in this. They are fighting in their countries for the same peaceful aims. Today the forces of world peace are the strongest. They can prevent a new war if they unite and act in a most resolute way everywhere.

"We know that such forces exist in your country as well. We want to believe in them. We call upon these forces to act, and fight resolutely before it is too late. You German working people must be their strongest and most active contingent.

"The World Federation of Trade Unions and its 114 million members fighting tirelessly for lasting peace remain staunchly loyal to the decisions adopted unanimously by trade union organizations during the establishment of the WFTU in 1945, and today they demand liquidation of militarism and the securing of peace through an immediate conclusion of the peace treaty.

"Let us unite all our forces and crush our common enemy, the imperialist instigators of war!

"Let us, through joint action, secure the signing of a German peace treaty and the solution of the problem of West Berlin through negotiation!"

WFTU Draft Program: Of probable major importance at the World Congress of Trade Unions in December and thereafter is the trade union unity program of WFTU. The new draft program explicitly calls for attacks on and exposures of ICFTU leaders for their anti-Communism, for their support of splits in the working class at the national and international levels, and as reformist advocates of class collaboration. It places great emphasis on the ICFTU leaders as capitalist tools and instruments of the monopolies. At the same time, instead of announcing the successes achieved in unity operations directed at the ICFTU affiliates, it calls for a more vigorous prosecution of unity from below on class questions, at both the national and international levels, as a means of discrediting and eliminating anti-Communist leaders.

The WFTU program states that its main task is to wage a decisive struggle for unity in the trade union movement, for the unity of all working class forces. To accomplish this task the WFTU urges all workers and trade unionists to increase their efforts:

To give a devastating answer to all those who hope to continue the cold war in the international trade union movement and who are trying to deepen and lengthen the break in it.

To develop and strengthen fraternal relations between the trade unions of all countries in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

To make their struggle for the vital interests of the workers more active on the basis of united action.

To strengthen continually the fraternal international solidarity of the workers in all countries.

To widen the struggle for the unity of the trade union movement nationally and internationally in each branch of industry and in each undertaking.

CULTS: Stalin and KhrushchevThe Cult of Stalin

"Hail the greatest genius of mankind, teacher and leader, who leads us victoriously to Communism, our own Stalin" (~~Stormy applause~~, turning into an ovation. All rise, there are shouts of 'Hurrah!', 'Hail the great Stalin', 'Comrade Stalin, hurrah!')

-N. S. Khrushchev, cited in 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Russian edition, Moscow, 1939), p. 174.

"Every Bolshevik, every worker, every citizen of our Soviet country must clearly realize that the successful and victorious destruction of Fascist agents--all those contemptible Trotskyites, Bukharinites and bourgeois nationalists--is owed, first of all, personally to our leader, our great Stalin. (Loud ovation)"

-N. S. Khrushchev, cited in 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party, (Russian edition, Moscow, 1939), p. 170.

"Comrades! The Soviet Union under the genius leadership of our wise leader and military commander Generalissimo Stalin /stormy applause, turning into an ovation. All rise, there are shouts: 'Hail Stalin,' 'Long life to our own father, Stalin (in Ukrainian)' /not only defended its freedom and independence, but made the decisive contribution to the struggle of all the United Nations against the German-Fascist usurpers, and saved the nations and civilization of Europe and the whole world from Fascist enslavement."

-N. S. Khrushchev, Restore Agriculture in the Soviet Ukraine Faster: Speech at the Republican Conference of Leaders of Agriculture in the Ukraine, January 18, 1946 (Russian edition, Kiev, 1946), p. 5.

"The leadership of our Leninist Central Committee and above all of Comrade Stalin personally, has been felt by our entire Party. We workers in the Moscow organization have felt this leadership... personally of Comrade Stalin directly and particularly from day to day in all questions... Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin the Right has been beaten in our Party, beaten in the Moscow organization... /which is/ ideologically united around the Central Committee, around our genius leader, Comrade Stalin. This principled ideological unity has been achieved thanks to the able daily leadership which we have had in the person of Lazar Moiseyevich Kaganovich. We have carried out in our Moscow organization a purge which has still more strengthened the fighting capacity of our ranks.

-N. S. Khrushchev, speech at 17th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party, 1934.

On the subject of collective leadership, Stalin stated to the German writer Emil Ludwig on 13 December 1931: "In this areopagus /the Central Committee/ is concentrated the wisdom of our Party."

"We must fight against the incorrect understanding on the part of some, of the process of creating a classless society. There are some who understand this question in the following way: We can, they say, rejoice... soon there will be no classes and we will not have to continue with the class war. /But/ the class war will not diminish, and we must mobilize the forces of the Party, the forces of the working class, to make stronger the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat /i.e., the NKVD/ for the final annihilation of the class enemies, of all the remnants of the Rightists and 'Leftists' and all the other opportunists who have wanted and who want to put brakes on our further successful movement forward."

-N. S. Khrushchev, speech at 17th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party, 1934.

"For all these successes the Ukrainian people like all the peoples of the Soviet Union are indebted to the Bolshevik Party, indebted to the leader of the Party and people, the great Stalin."

-N. S. Khrushchev, in The Stalinist Friendship of Nations: A Guarantee for the Invincibility of Our Homeland (Russian edition, Moscow, 1949), p. 10.

(Continued)

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6
"Comrade Stalin daily releases his help to our collective farms, especially about young collective farms of the western provinces of the Ukraine, and gives them every sort of assistance."
-N. S. Khrushchev, in Pravda Ukrainy, Oct. 30, 1949.

"The vigilance of Ukrainian workers and peasants has increased. We will constantly raise this quality and kill like cockroaches any abominable creatures which foreign intelligence services may send to our Ukrainian land. The Ukrainian people, having destroyed enemies and traitors, has rallied even more tightly around the Bolshevik Party and our great Stalin."
-N. S. Khrushchev, 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Russian edition, Moscow, 1939), p. 170.

"These successes did not come of themselves; they were won in the cruel struggle with enemies of the working class, with enemies of the peasantry, with enemies of our people, in the struggle with agents of fascist espionage--with Trotskyites, Bukharinites, and bourgeois nationalists."
-N. S. Khrushchev, 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Russian edition, Moscow, 1939), p. 169.

"Comrade Stalin illuminates our lives with the brilliant light of science; he provides a program of action and directs our victorious movement towards Communism.... Glory to the great Stalin!"
-Anastas Mikoyan, speech in 19th Party Congress, 1952.

... And The Cult of Khrushchev

"Every time you /Khrushchev/ go abroad, you take with you a part of each one of us.... Every time /you/ return from abroad having successfully fulfilled a mission of peace and friendship, /you/ not only return to us 'a part of each one of us'-- /you/ enrich for all of us our understanding of the supreme tasks which are presented before the peoples in the struggle for peace and progress."
-Pravda, 21 Oct. 1960.

"Did the Trotskyites at this time [1937] actually constitute such a danger to our Party and to the Soviet state? We should recall that in 1927 on the eve of the XVth Party Congress only some 4000 votes were cast for the Trotskyite-Zinovievite opposition, while there were 724,000 for the Party line. During the 10 years which were passed between the XVth Party Congress and the February-March [1937] Central Committee Plenum Trotskyism was completely disarmed; many former Trotskyites had changed their former views and worked in the various sectors building socialism. It is clear that in the situation of socialist victory there was no basis for mass terror in the country."
-N. S. Khrushchev, Secret Speech delivered to the 20th Congress of the CPSU, 25 Feb 56.

"He /Stalin/ knew the country and agriculture only from films. And these films had dressed up and beautified the existing situation in agriculture. Many films so pictured kolkhoz life that the tables were bending from the weight of turkeys and geese. Evidently Stalin thought that it was actually so."
-N. S. Khrushchev, Secret speech delivered to the 20th Congress of the CPSU, 25 Feb 56.

"His /Khrushchev's/ tireless energy and revolutionary passion inspire us all to fighting deeds. Comrade Khrushchev is distinguished by his great faith in the people and in the strength of our party, by firmness and unyieldingness in carrying out its line, refusal to be reconciled with the enemies of communism, and his boldness and resolution in carrying out the domestic and foreign policies of the party and Soviet state."
-Leonid Brezhnev, Speech at 22nd CPSU Congress, 19 Oct 51, as broadcast by Soviet Domestic radio.

"In the implementation of the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet state, the personal activities of the Soviet head of government, Nikita Khrushchev play a gigantic part."
-Leonid Brezhnev, Speech at 22nd CPSU Congress, 19 Oct. 61, as broadcast in German to Germany.

Approved For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040014-6
"The speeches of Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev and the literature are giving invaluable aid to the artistic intelligentsia in their creative work. Developing the Leninist teaching on the party approach to literature, Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev set for writers, artists, composers, workers of the screen and theater, supremely important problems of creative work. He profoundly revealed the necessity and significance of close links between people of literature and the arts and the life of the people "

-Yekaterina Furtseva, Speech at 22nd CPSU Congress, 21 Oct. 61.

"The CPSU has come to the 22nd Congress as an even more powerful and invincible cohort, even closer to the Soviet people, and closely rallied around its Leninist Central Committee headed by Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev, an outstanding Leninist and a very great leader of our party (Applause). The new CPSU program is a very great document of our time. Comrade Khrushchev's remarkable reports contain a profound Marxist analysis of world events and of the prospects for their development, and exhaustive analysis of the party's activity during the period under review, a formulation of the party's most important tasks and a profound definition of the content and significance in terms of world history, of the CPSU Draft Program submitted to the congress."

-Mikhail Suslov, Speech at 22nd CPSU Congress, 21 Oct. 61.

"Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev's reports at the congress contain the scientific and Marxist analysis of the fundamental processes of social development; there the vital problems of the theory and practice of communist construction are raised and worked out. The program of the CPSU and the speeches of Comrade Khrushchev at the congress constitute a remarkable example of a profound analysis of social life and the creative development and enrichment of the Marxist-Leninist theory. (Stormy applause)"

-A. N. Kosygin, Speech at 22nd CPSU Congress, 21 Oct. 61.

"The activities of Comrade Khrushchev--his inexhaustible seething energy, his truly revolutionary Leninist approach to the solution of complicated questions of theory and practice, his firm link with the people, his humaneness and simplicity, and his ability to always learn from the masses and to teach the masses--are an inspiring example for the entire party and every communist. (Stormy applause)"

-N. V. Podgornyy, First Secretary of the Ukrainian CP, Speech at 22nd CPSU Congress, 19 Oct. 61.

"It is not accidental that many party, administrative, and creative workers still describe the period of Kaganovich's sojourn as the 'dark days of the Soviet Ukraine.' Kaganovich fanned the cult of Stalin's personality, toadied to him, took advantage of his weaknesses for his own careerist aims, and created at the same time the cult of his own personality in posing as the leader of the Ukrainian people. It was for that purpose that articles were published in the press praising his activities in the Ukraine in the thirties. . . . It went to such lengths that he demanded, for instance, that artists should add his portrait to completed paintings about the liberation of the Ukraine from the German invaders, though he had nothing to do with those events. . . . He /Kaganovich/ began to agitate for a convening of the plenary session of the Central Committee including on the agenda: 'The struggle against nationalism as the principal danger to the Communist Party, Bolshevik, of the Ukraine,' Though there was not the slightest danger of that kind, and could not be, because the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine had been headed for many years, to our good fortune, by the staunch Leninist, Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev, who had been educating the communists and the Ukrainian people in the spirit of internationalism (stormy applause), of friendship of the peoples, and of boundless devotion to the great ideas of Leninism. (Stormy, prolonged applause)

-N. V. Podgornyy, Speech at the 22nd CPSU Congress, 19 Oct. 61.

"I was well acquainted with Comrade Yakir, I also knew Tukhachevskiy, but not as well as Yakir. This year during a conference in Alma Ata I was approached by his son, who works in Kazakhstan. He asked me about his father. What could I tell him? When we investigated this case in the Presidium of the Central Committee and were told that neither Tukhachevskiy, Yakir, or Yuborevich had perpetrated any crimes against the party or the state, we asked Molotov, Kaganovich, and Voroshilov: Are you in favor of rehabilitating them? Yes, we are in favor, they replied. But it was you who executed these people

we said with Approval For Release 2001/11/16 : CIA-RDP78-03061A000100040011-6
speech; she stated: "It was also, then, at the discussion, that Nikita Sergeyevich very calmly but directly asked: 'When were you right, then? ... When you voted for their fate to be decided so tragically, or now when you rehabilitate them fully? Tell me, when were you right?' " / So when did you act according to your conscience--then or now? But they gave no reply to this question, and they will not give one. You have heard what remarks they put in letters to Stalin. What can they say?"
-N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at 22nd CPSU Congress, 27 October 1961.

"In many speeches at the congress, and not infrequently in our press, special emphasis is laid on my person in discussing the activities of the Central Committee.... Now I appreciate the kind sentiments guiding these comrades. May I, however, emphasize most emphatically that everything said about me should be addressed to the Central Committee of our Leninist party, the Presidium of the Central Committee. (Stormy, prolonged applause) Not a single major measure, not a single responsible speech has been made on anyone's personal instructions, but is the result of collective discussion and collective decision. (Stormy applause) This concluding speech, too, was examined and endorsed by the leading collective. (Prolonged applause)"
-N. S. Khrushchev, Speech at 22nd CPSU Congress, 27 October 1961.

On the next day, however, Frol Kozlov spoke, using in his speech such phrases as: "In Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev's report on the CPSU Draft Program the necessity for the introduction of these important new provisions is broadly and profoundly proved;" and "In the struggle against the antiparty, fractionalist group, in the defense of the Leninist policy of our party, Bolshevik firmness and principles were displayed by the first secretary of the Central Committee of our party, Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev (Applause)."

The following points should be noted in reading the above quotations:

1. Both Khrushchev and Mikoyan formerly had only the most sycophantic praise for Stalin; Khrushchev now leads the attack on the dead leader.
2. Khrushchev also praised Kaganovich highly when Kaganovich was senior to him in the Party. He now attacks him, as well as other former colleagues, such as Malenkov, Molotov, and even the aged and now harmless Voroshilov.
3. Further, Kaganovich is reproached for falsifying history (as in having himself inserted in pictures of the liberation of the Ukraine; a similar accusation could be levelled against Malenkov) and for voting for the "rehabilitation" of people whose execution he had formerly supported. But more recently, Soviet historiography has been diligently inflating Khrushchev's role as political commissar with the Southern armies in World War II, esp. at Stalingrad. At the same time, Khrushchev's other activities in the Stalin period are now played down, much more than in the 1956 Secret Speech; the aim of this is to create the impression that Khrushchev bore no share in Stalinist repression. Actually, Khrushchev had become a member of the USSR Politburo by 1939, as a result of such services as the hasty pushing through of the Moscow subway with prison labor and a complete disregard of safety precautions. Khrushchev's statements in 1939 on vigilance, and on Trotskyites and Bukharinites do not suggest that he was trying to defend them then.
4. With the false modesty of Caesar refusing the Roman crown, Khrushchev stated on 27 October "that everything said about me should be addressed to the Central Committee of our Leninist party, the Presidium of the Central Committee." Nevertheless, Kozlov still praised him the next day, and it is noteworthy that the loudest praises of Khrushchev at the 22nd Congress did not come from minor Soviet officials or from satellite leaders but from those individuals, like Brezhnev, Furtseva, and Kosygin, who have risen along with him, who know him best and presumably knew best what he wanted them to say. The praises of Khrushchev as a guide to artists and authors, or as a profound Marxist analyst, are particularly striking as attempts to build Khrushchev up into something he obviously is not. The world will know that the cult of personality has really been laid to rest when--and only when--it becomes possible for speakers in party congresses or other such gatherings to publicly criticize the First Chairman of the Party.